

Appendix

The research documents reviewed in this study are described in this Appendix. The top panel in each exhibit indicates, in addition to the document's name and authors, the date and place of publication. An abstract of the document is provided in the second panel. The next two panels summarize the topics covered in the document, the methods and data used, and the analytical approach.

Document TE-1			
Authors	AFYA Inc.		
Title	Post-Employment Services: Making Job Retention and Post-Employment Services Work -Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network Workshop Summary		
Publication Date	May 1998		
Publication Organization	Administration for Children and Families, HHS		
Abstract			
<p>In response to mid-1990s research that found that between 40 and 70 percent of former welfare recipients were unemployed 12 months after leaving welfare, ACF established the Post-Employment Services Demonstration (PESD) in four sites. The target population for PESD was welfare recipients who had participated in the states' JOBS initiatives and recently found employment.</p> <p>Methodology/ Program Structure: Between 4,500 and 5,000 individuals were assigned to participate, and about half of that group was assigned to participate in PESD. At each of the four demonstration sites, there were between 400 and 500 individuals in each of the PESD and JOBS groups. JOBS program participants were eligible to incur a maximum of \$400 expenses, if that was requested within 30 days of leaving welfare. In contrast, PESD participants were eligible to receive up to \$1,000 for employment expenses. In addition, case workers followed up with PESD participations in their first, second, fourth and sixth weeks of employment.</p> <p>Lessons Learned/ Preliminary Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PESD program staff held that, while they were able to help clients address child care and transportation issues, they were not able to meet the needs of some of the harder to serve clients. Specifically, they felt less able to help clients who struggled with drug abuse, domestic violence or gang involvement. ▪ Staff asserted that it was difficult to stay in contact with "volunteer" participants – i.e., people who were no longer receiving welfare. ▪ Participants got low paying jobs with few benefits, odd hours, etc. ▪ There were mixed employment patterns across the sample in terms of who got jobs and how long folks kept jobs. ▪ Welfare recipients faced numerous personal and system-related barriers that made employment difficult. ▪ Job retention programs can address some of these barriers. ▪ Broader system-wide policy changes at the state/local system level may make the transition from welfare to work easier. ▪ It is possible to implement programs such as PESD. ▪ Effective intra and inter-agency communication is important <p>The article also highlights several employer-centered retention strategies and support services, specifically (1) the Welfare to Work Partnership's work both with United Airlines and CVS Pharmacy, and (2) the State of North Carolina's Enhanced Employee Assistance Program. While this piece does not form any major conclusions about either of these, it does highlight them as possible promising examples of effective strategies for facilitating retention.</p>			
Employer Practices	Employee Characteristics	Labor Market Functioning	Government Policies
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods	Qualitative Data	Quantitative Data: Survey	Quantitative Data: Records
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other
What does this document address?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Best Practices <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context	

Document TE-2

Authors	Amanda Ahlstrand and Max Armbruster
Title	Workplace Education Investments and Strategies for Low -Wage Workers: Patterns and Practices in Employer-Provided Education (in <i>Low Wage Workers in the New Economy</i> , R. Kazis and M. Miller, eds.)
Publication Date	2001
Publication Organization	Urban Institute Press

Abstract

This chapter reviews survey and interview data on employers' practices in training low -skill workers.

Methodology:

- The American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) benchmarking service gathers data on employers' education and training practices. Employers submit their data to ASTD to receive a customized benchmarking report that enables them to compare their investments with those of others. In 1998, the service was expanded to collect information on the outcomes of employers' training and education practices and to provide additional data on education outcomes for low -wage workers. About 2,500 employers are included in the ASTD database, and about two-thirds of these are U.S.-based.
- ASTD also followed-up and conducted 40 telephone surveys with selected respondents to collect more in-depth information than was collected through the measurement kit.

Key findings:

- Higher skilled workers tend to get more workplace education and on-the-job training. In 1998, 47 percent of employers reported spending nothing on training employees who had fewer than 12 years of education.
- Mid-sized employers (500-1,999 employees) devote more resources to training lower-wage workers—and, accordingly, are labeled as "friendly" to low wage workers—than do other sized companies. "Friendly" organizations are also concentrated in trade and health care industries; in the Midwest; and among publicly-traded and family-owned companies.
- There is a positive correlation between friendly organizations and the percentage of all employees receiving training. However, friendly organizations spend less per employee on training compared with other companies.
- The rationale organizations provide for training low -skill employees includes (1) improvement in work quality and customer service, and (2) facilitation of recruitment and retention.
- Organizations face barriers when training low -skill workers, including time, language and literacy issues, lack of managerial buy-in, shortage of staff, and difficulty scheduling training.
- Organizations were "friendly" because (1) training and development were part of those organizations' cultures; (b) there was an economic rationale for providing training; and/or (c) the nature of the organizations' work required extensive training.
- Public policy issues: (a) Employers did not express concerns about the cost and likelihood of losing workers after training; and (b) "friendly" employers were more likely to rely on government agencies to provide training than other companies.

Employer Practices	Employee Characteristics	Labor Market Functioning	Government Policies
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Industries	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Geography	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compensation	<input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand	<input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority	<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories	<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
Not training?		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
Qualitative Methods	Qualitative Data	Quantitative Data: Survey	Quantitative Data: Records
<input type="checkbox"/> Case Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer	<input type="checkbox"/> CPS	<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee	<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP	<input type="checkbox"/> WA
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Markets	<input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI	<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Four City	<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-3

Authors David Fischer and Neil Scott Kleiman, with Julian Alssid
Title Rebuilding Job Training From the Ground Up: Workforce System Reform After 9/11
Publication Date August 2002
Publication Organization Center for an Urban Future

Abstract

This article reviews the status of workforce development in New York City and makes several recommendations for the future. The authors begin by lamenting the state of workforce development and pertinent programs throughout the 1980s and 1990s, commenting that they were fragmented and lacked an appropriate business focus. The authors assert that, in order to be effective, the future workforce system must be (1) designed by and responsive to employers and (2) well coordinated. (All agencies must better provide services, clarify who does what, etc.)

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-4

Authors Fredrik Andersson, Harry Holzer, and Julia Lane
Title The Interactions of Workers and Firms in the Low -Wage Labor Market
Publication Date December 2002
Publication Organization Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, HHS

Abstract

This paper is an analysis of workers who persistently have low earnings in the labor market over a period of three or more years. Some exit low -earning status, others do not.

Key findings:

- Twelve percent of prime-age adults in the U.S. had low earnings (\$12,000 per year or less) that persisted over a period of at least three years.
- Low earnings are associated both with demographic characteristics and characteristics of the firms for which they work (industry, size, turnover/net employment growth rates, etc.).
- Of those with persistently low earnings, nearly half exited this status within three years, although earnings did not improve much.
- White males escaped low earnings more than other race/gender groups.
- Job and industry changes are associated with large percentages of observed improvements in earnings.
- Most earnings improvements for low -income women were in the service sector, while men fare better in "traditional" industries such as construction.

Conclusions

- Some degree of upward mobility for persistently low earners is certainly possible, even though improvements are modest.
- There is no single path for achieving earnings growth.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-5

Author	The Association of Joint Labor-Management Educational Programs
Title	Success by Design: What Works in Workforce Development
Publication Date	December 2002
Publication Organization	The Conference Board of Canada

Abstract

Joint Training Programs (JTP) give workers, employers, and unions a wide range of benefits due to the skills gained through study and training. Worker skill gains translate into performance gains for employers, which increases profitability.

From the employer's perspective, skills gained include: improved literacy skills, improved job-specific skills, improved communication skills, better personal management, increased self-confidence. The benefits of these skills include: improved customer service, improved quality of work, increased productivity, fewer errors, better communication with co-workers and managers, better understanding of job tasks, greater appreciation of learning.

The study identifies 12 key design elements of the JTP that contribute to their success:

- Continuous process of balanced, collaborative consultation between labor and management, based on concurrence developed through collective bargaining.
- Learning needs analysis during program development process.
- Career/educational planning service available.
- Access to continuing education opportunities.
- Access to financial assistance for education and training.
- Program marketing and promotion
- Measuring and evaluating program effectiveness
- Dual training focus: meeting worker and workplace needs.
- Voluntary participation of workers, whenever possible.
- Worker involvement in designing, implementing, and evaluating training.
- Multiple learning strategies for worker-students.
- Specific criteria for selecting and evaluating educational and training providers.
- The study concluded that JTPs harness the power of collaboration between unions and management to produce exceptional training results.

Employer Practices	Employee Characteristics	Labor Market Functioning	Government Policies
<input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Industries	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Geography	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input type="checkbox"/> Compensation	<input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand	<input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority	<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories	<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
Qualitative Methods	Qualitative Data	Quantitative Data: Survey	Quantitative Data: Records
<input type="checkbox"/> Case Study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer	<input type="checkbox"/> CPS	<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee	<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP	<input type="checkbox"/> WA
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Markets	<input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI	<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Four City	<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Authors	David Autor and Susan Houseman		
Title	The Role of Temporary Employment Agencies in Welfare to Work: Part of the Problem or Part of the Solution?		
Publication Date	2002		
Publication Organization	Focus, vol. 22, no. 1		
Abstract			
<p>This study examines the experience of welfare recipients in temporary help jobs in Washington State. It is based on UI and TANF data from the State.</p> <p>A large share of welfare recipients' employment is in the temporary-help sector. Between 1996 and 1999, it accounted for 5-15% of employment of TANF recipients in Washington, depending on the subgroup. Thus, temporary help is a central player in welfare reform. The impacts of temporary-help employment on earnings and job advancement are unknown, but often assumed to be negative. The effects may actually be beneficial in many instances.</p> <p>Given the importance of temporary-help employment, more public policy attention should be given to the topic, including evaluation research. They authors offer several policy and research recommendations.</p>			
Employer Practices	Employee Characteristics	Labor Market Functioning	Government Policies
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods	Qualitative Data	Quantitative Data: Survey	Quantitative Data: Records
<input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
What does this document address?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective	<input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Context	

Author	Timothy Bartik		
Title	Fighting Poverty with Labor Demand Policies		
Publication Date	2001a		
Publication Organization	W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research		
Abstract			
<p>Labor supply policies—such as welfare reform, job training, and the Earned Income Tax Credit—directly interact with the poor to increase their labor supply, job skills, and wages. Labor demand policies directly interact with employers to affect the number of poor persons hired (I.e. the New Deal public works programs and tax credits for employers who hire the disadvantaged).</p> <p>Why should we use labor demand policies? (1) More jobs are needed by the American poor. For every poor household to have one full-time, full-year worker, nine million more jobs are needed. (2) Labor supply policies have their limitations. It is expensive for labor supply policies to produce large increases in employment for the poor; the EITC has increased employment by only half a million persons. (3) Lowering unemployment does not solve the problem of poverty. For example, in 1999 the unemployment rate was 4.2 percent while the poverty rate was 11.8%.</p> <p>Bartik recommends a revised version of the New Jobs Tax Credit for employers who expand overall employment in high-unemployment area. The subsidy would be credited against payroll taxes. He also recommends a version of the MEED used in Minnesota in the 1980s. Local workforce boards would award wage subsidies to selected employers that hired selected individuals from disadvantaged groups. To reduce displacement of current workers, the subsidies could go only for newly created jobs.</p>			
Employer Practices	Employee Characteristics	Labor Market Functioning	Government Policies
<input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods	Qualitative Data	Quantitative Data: Survey	Quantitative Data: Records
<input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other
What does this document address?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective	<input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Context	

Document TE-8

Author Timothy Bartik
Title Jobs for the Poor: Can Labor Demand Policies Help?
Publication Date 2001b
Publication Organization Russell Sage Foundation

Abstract

The key points in Chapter 2 (*Labor Supply and Demand Policies: Descriptions, Classifications, Cross-National Comparisons and History*) are:

- The U.S. relies much less on labor demand policies than on labor supply policies. Many Western European countries use a more balanced approach of supply and demand-focused policies.
- Large scale labor demand policies in the U.S. have not proven to be politically sustainable. This can be explained in part by opposition from business and conservatives and by luke-warm support from labor and some liberals.
- Before considering specific types of labor supply and demand focused policies, it is important to consider how these policies affect the labor market. The relative effectiveness of labor supply versus demand policies depends on how the low-wage labor market works, and, in particular, on how labor supply and demand respond to market forces.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-9

Authors David D. Bellis and Susan J. Lawless
Title Workforce Development Consortia Provide Needed Services
Publication Date October 2001
Publication Organization United States General Accounting Office

Abstract

This is a report for Senator Christopher S. Bond, Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Overview of workforce development consortia in four communities: Austin, TX,; Cedar Rapids, IA; Charlotte, NC; and Milwaukee, WI. Consortium membership often included school districts, business and trade organizations, labor unions, and community-based service organizations, such as the YWCA and family services agencies. Workforce consortia in TX and IA created intermediary organizations to facilitate the coordination and cooperation of workforce development activities among consortium members and to act as a broker of information and services. The primary reason for a community to form a workforce consortium is to address local workforce needs that are not being met by market forces.

A brief summary of the four interviewed workforce development consortia is presented, including why the consortia were formed and participating institutions. The report discusses the various activities a workforce consortium is capable of and provides contextual examples from the four interviewed communities. Activities include:

- Addressing current and future workforce needs,
- Guiding young adults to future workforce opportunities,
- Organizing around industry sectors to meet business needs,
- Consortia-led leadership to sustain positive working relationships within the community,
- Resource accessibility to businesses and prospective workers,
- Providing incentives to attract business participation.

Little information is available or presented on program outcomes. Although each of the visited consortia have some limited data-collection practices, consortia organizations did not have systems in place to evaluate overall effectiveness.

Employer Practices <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Best Practices	<input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context
<input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes	

Document TE-10

Author Stephen Bliss
Title San Francisco Works: Toward an Employer-Led Approach to Welfare Reform and Workforce Development
Publication Date March 2000
Publication Organization Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation

Abstract

San Francisco Works was established in 1997 to coordinate the business community's involvement in local welfare to work efforts. The organization has two main objectives: (1) creating job training programs closely tied to real workforce needs, and with the participation of actual employers; and (2) helping welfare recipients obtain jobs with wages high enough to make entry-level work more financially attractive than welfare.

Key Findings:

- Private sector-led intermediaries that focus on employment of welfare recipients can be successful in engaging a variety of employers and private sector resources and in placing welfare recipients in employment.
- Private sector intermediaries can build relationships with employers by framing their welfare to work efforts in business terms—such as potentially high return on investment of business involvement in workforce development—and can leverage these key relationships by gaining access to employer groups and private sector resources.
- There is a crucial distinction between "business-backed" and "employer-led" initiatives. Business-backed initiatives rely on the private sector for few commitments beyond financial backing; employer-led initiatives engage employers in all facets of employment training by seeking active participation and buy-in at various levels of companies' organizational structures and by identifying advocates for the program within the business.
- Private sector welfare-to-work intermediaries can become an important route for identifying strengths and weaknesses in existing systems and service providers. Private sector intermediaries can also be an influential force in improving the system and increasing its capacity to serve disadvantaged populations well.
- Paid internships and mentoring are two potentially powerful motivating factors for welfare-to-work participants.

<p>Employer Practices</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Employee Characteristics</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Labor Market Functioning</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Government Policies</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
<p>Qualitative Methods</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Qualitative Data</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<p>Quantitative Data: Survey</p> <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Quantitative Data: Records</p> <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-11

Authors Dan Bloom and Charles Michalopoulos
Title How Welfare and Work Policies Affect Employment and Income: A Synthesis of Research
Publication Date May 2001
Publication Organization Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation

Abstract

This monograph synthesizes the results from 29 MDRC random-assignment evaluations of welfare reform initiatives. Findings:

- The most successful welfare to work programs combined education and training services with mandatory employment (Work First) activities.
- The only programs that increased both work and family income were those that provided earnings supplements to low-wage workers.
- Little is known about the impacts of TANF time limits, but the available research evidence suggests that the limits do not cause substantial family hardships, at least in the short run.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
 Performance Assessment
 Compensation
 Training
 Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
 Race
 Child care/Transportation
 Experience/Seniority
 Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
 Geography
 Supply/Demand
 Job Categories
 Market Intermediaries
 Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
 Employer Incentives
 Employee Placement
 Anti-Discrimination
 Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
 Promising Practices Assessment
 Qualitative Evaluation
 Implementation Study
 Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
 Employee
 Markets
 Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
 SIPP
 MCSUI
 Four City
 Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
 WIA
 LEHD
 BLS
 Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
 TANF Recipient Perspective
 Best Practices
 Employment Outcomes
 Economic Context

Document TE-12

Author Brian Bosworth
Title Working Together on Worker Training *(Part of a Series of Reports on Engaging Employers in Workforce Development)*
Publication Date February 2002
Publication Organization Jobs for the Future

Abstract

This brief report contends that firms should work together on workforce development and provides some supporting evidence. It explores several examples of "cooperative" employer workforce development and provides suggestions for future inter-firm workforce development efforts. The brief argues that, by working together on workforce development, employers can ensure that training provided is aligned with their needs and can save on training costs. It suggests that employer organizations can play a lead role in this process.

Finally, the brief identifies several "key elements" of organizing and managing training collaboratives, including: (1) keeping employers in charge, (2) aiming for "the right balance" between breadth of participation and depth of commitment, (3) working with extant collaboratives and organizations, (4) ensuring that the individual leading collaborative efforts is effective, (5) understanding that, eventually, it is likely that participating firms will have to pay for training services, (6) using recognized skill assessment tools, (7) choosing effective training vendors, and (8) defining goals for the collaborative at the outset.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-13

Primary Author Heather Boushey
Secondary Author
Title Staying Employed After Welfare: Work Supports and Job Quality Vital to Employment Tenure and Wage Growth
Publication Date June 2002
Publication Organization Economic Policy Institute

Abstract

This paper examines whether and how the experiences of women with a history of welfare differ from other women in the labor market. The study attempts to discern the "role of work supports and job quality on employment duration and real wage growth." Specifically, the paper examines the roles of starting job quality and the 1990's economic upturn, and the consequences of these factors for families. Using the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), data were assembled for samples of women covering periods in the late and early 1990's. The analysis of these data found that job retention was higher among individuals who received work support (e.g., childcare). However, longer job tenure did not necessarily translate into wage growth. Higher quality jobs were also found to be integral to job retention and wage growth. Boushey noted that WorkFirst welfare programs did not target high quality employers.

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| Employer Practices
<input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Compensation
<input type="checkbox"/> Training
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Employee Characteristics
<input type="checkbox"/> Skills
<input type="checkbox"/> Race
<input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Labor Market Functioning
<input type="checkbox"/> Industries
<input type="checkbox"/> Geography
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand
<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories
<input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Government Policies
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| Qualitative Methods
<input type="checkbox"/> Case Study
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Qualitative Data
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Markets
<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies | Quantitative Data: Survey
<input type="checkbox"/> CPS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SIPP
<input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI
<input type="checkbox"/> Four City
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Quantitative Data: Records
<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> WIA
<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other |

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-14

Author Maria L. Buck
Title Charting New Territory: Early Implementation of the Workforce Investment Act
Publication Date January 2002
Publication Organization Public/Private Ventures

Abstract

The study first presents the components of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) and discusses the context in which five states made the decision to become early implementers of the new legislation. The rest of the report describes the impact of WIA on four audiences: employment and training providers, job seekers, employers, and the general workforce development system. The study seeks to highlight issues for policymakers and to provide guidance to states and localities implementing WIA through an examination of the experiences of five early implementing cities. The study used a process study on implementation of WIA in five cities: Charlotte, NC; Houston, TX; Orlando, FL; Philadelphia, PA; and Boston, MA.

Key findings:

- The study cites state-level leadership as a major factor in determining WIA implementation success.
- The consolidation of TANF funding and programming into workforce development activities reduced duplication of efforts in the broader welfare-to-work movement that links both agencies.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-15

Primary Author Center for Workforce Participation
Secondary Author
Title Rising to the Challenge: Business Voices on the Public Workforce Development System
Publication Date Spring 2003
Publication Organization U.S. Chamber of Commerce

Abstract

In early 2003, the Center for Workforce Preparation (CWP) conducted a survey of employers. The purpose of this survey was to examine the perceptions, use, and awareness of public workforce investment systems. Local chambers of commerce acted as intermediaries for data collection between CWP and local employers.

The results of the survey indicate that:

- Half of employers were having a hard time finding qualified applicants at the time they were interviewed.
- The largest percentage of employers believe that economic development is the primary goal of workforce development.
- Less than half of employers were aware of One Stop Centers and less than one in five reported using them during the previous year.
- Several reasons were given by employers for not using One Stops. The most common were lack of awareness of the Centers and the availability of other options.

The authors conclude that, to be more effective, workforce investment boards and One-Stop Centers should take a more active role in engaging the private sector.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- Best Practices
- Economic Context
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Employment Outcomes

Document TE-16

Authors Peggy Clark and Steven Dawson
Title Jobs and the Urban Poor: Privately Initiated Sectoral Strategies
Publication Date November 1995
Publication Organization The Aspen Institute

Abstract

Methodology:

This report is based upon a literature review, discussions with experts in the field, and case studies of ten urban sectoral initiatives.

Key findings:

- Sectoral strategies have significant potential to increase economic opportunities for the urban poor.
- Sectoral strategies are thought to represent an advance over economic development, community development and education and training programs because each of these types of programs has a more narrow and shorter-term focus than sectoral strategies.
- Recent sectoral strategy theory has focused on the importance of industry "clusters" in developing a region's competitiveness. Sectoral strategies try to bolster the relationships among related companies by setting up networks to bring firms and other key players together to work on issues.
- Sectoral strategies target clearly defined sectors and develop comprehensive knowledge of the way in which that sector works. They are strategic and establish long-term goals upfront and have long planning horizons.
- Sectoral strategies bring in a wide range of key players, including industry, labor, and the public sector.
- Sectoral strategies do have some limitations. They can be industry driven, and, as a result, if unchecked, can neglect broad, public sector goals. In addition, if not spearheaded by independent entities, sectoral initiatives can be vulnerable when political leadership changes.
- Of those initiatives studied, successful sectoral strategies were most often led by organizations that had a comprehensive focus. Initiatives that did not have lead agencies tended to be fragmented. In these initiatives, both industry and community based organizations (CBOs) played key roles. Of the industries studied, most implemented job training and related support services and many provided information and technical assistance directly to businesses. Project impacts were greatest in the area of building inter-firm linkages. A relatively small number of jobs have been created to date as a result of these initiatives, however many training efforts have been successful. Most initiatives did not pay close attention to job quality, but nonetheless succeeded in facilitating the provision of improved employment opportunities for workers.
- Sectoral strategies work best when overall economic conditions of a region are healthy, the initiative targets a sector that has a labor shortage that the urban poor can potentially fill, CBOs that advocate for the urban poor participate, the initiative can communicate information about job opportunities to the urban poor, the initiative provides both occupational training and support services, and the initiative provides both occupational training and support services to the urban poor.

Employer Practices	Employee Characteristics	Labor Market Functioning	Government Policies
<input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring	<input type="checkbox"/> Skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Industries	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Geography	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input type="checkbox"/> Compensation	<input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand	<input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority	<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories	<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
Qualitative Methods	Qualitative Data	Quantitative Data: Survey	Quantitative Data: Records
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer	<input type="checkbox"/> CPS	<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee	<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP	<input type="checkbox"/> WIA
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Markets	<input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI	<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Four City	<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective Best Practices Economic Context
 TANF Recipient Perspective Employment Outcomes

Document TE-17

Authors Maureen Conway and Lily Zandniapour
Title Industry-Based Employment Programs: Implications for Welfare Reauthorization and Key Survey Findings
Publication Date 2002
Publication Organization The Aspen Institute

Abstract

The article is a brief examination of the Sectoral Employment Development Learning Project (SEDLP), the Aspen Institute's study of industry-based or sectoral approaches to employment training to help low-income individuals advance in the labor market. The article focuses on the outcomes of the training programs for welfare recipients. According to the article/study, the training programs helped the welfare receiving subsample improve in the following areas (compared to the overall TANF population): (1) increased earnings; (2) increased employability (both employment rate and number of hours worked); (3) decreased reliance on public assistance; and (4) increased job quality (measured by employer-provided benefits and job satisfaction).

Using the information gathered in the SEDLP study (along with evidence from other studies), four policy recommendations are presented to improve welfare legislation (TANF). The recommendations are characterized by transferring more of the decision-making power to the state level, as states are more knowledgeable of their own needs, and providing states with logistic and financial support for educational and training services for welfare recipients.

Participating programs:

- Asian Neighborhood Design, San Francisco, California
- Garment Industry Development Corporation, New York, New York
- Focus HOPE, Detroit, MI
- Jane Addams Resource Corporation, Chicago, IL
- Paraprofessional Healthcare Institute, Bronx, New York
- 6. Project QUEST, San Antonio, Texas

<p>Employer Practices</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Employee Characteristics</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Labor Market Functioning</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Government Policies</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
<p>Qualitative Methods</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Qualitative Data</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<p>Quantitative Data: Survey</p> <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Quantitative Data: Records</p> <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-18

Authors	Sandra Danziger and Kristin Seefeldt
Title	Barriers to Employment and the "Hard to Serve": Implications for Services, Sanctions, and Time Limits
Publication Date	2002
Publication Organization	Focus, vol. 22, no. 1

Abstract

The article discusses the kinds of barriers faced by individuals who are deemed "hard to serve," and discusses the ways in which welfare policy should be structured to ensure that individuals who possess serious barriers are not forced to leave public assistance before they are ready or able to do so.

Methodology:

The Women's Employment Study (WES) follows a cohort of welfare recipients from one urban Michigan county from 1997 through 1999. It compares the characteristics of recipients who work continuously and receive welfare for relatively long periods of time with those who do not.

Key findings:

(1) The likelihood that an individual was employed was significantly reduced if she had any of the following:

- no high school diploma
- little work experience
- few job skills
- perceptions of discrimination
- a transportation problem
- was depressed
- had a maternal or child health problem

However, some individuals were employed consistently despite barriers that persisted over time.

(2) Many of the barriers that inhibited individuals' ability to work consistently were not easily observable (depression, mental health issues, domestic violence, etc.) The failure to identify these kinds of barriers puts the hard to serve at higher risk of sanctions if these problems make them less likely to be able to comply with PRWORA work requirements.

(3) Individuals who leave welfare because they have been sanctioned (as opposed to leaving because they have found jobs) are more likely to possess barriers that suggest they may be hard to serve than are individuals who leave welfare because they have obtained employment.

(4) By mid-2000, it appeared that roughly 60,000 families nationwide had lost welfare benefits because of time limits.

Employer Practices	Employee Characteristics	Labor Market Functioning	Government Policies
<input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Industries	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Geography	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input type="checkbox"/> Compensation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand	<input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority	<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories	<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
Qualitative Methods	Qualitative Data	Quantitative Data: Survey	Quantitative Data: Records
<input type="checkbox"/> Case Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer	<input type="checkbox"/> CPS	<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Employee	<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP	<input type="checkbox"/> WA
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Markets	<input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI	<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Four City	<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-19

Author Randall W. Eberts
Title Design, Implementation and Evaluation of the Work-First Profiling Project
Publication Date March 2002
Publication Organization W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research

Abstract

The report describes an assessment and referral system that was created to help WtW program staff target employment services more effectively with the goal of helping welfare recipients find jobs. The system was pilot tested with the Kalamazoo-St. Joseph Workforce Development Board. A random assignment evaluation found that, using a job retention rate of 90 consecutive days as the target employment outcome, the "optimal referral pattern" based on the pilot-tested system yielded retention rates that were 25 percent higher than those for participants that were placed not using the system.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-20

Authors Mark Elliott and Elizabeth King
Title Labor Market Leverage: Sectoral Employment Field Report
Publication Date Winter 1999
Publication Organization Public/Private Ventures

Abstract

Sectoral employment strategies, in the economic context of a changing labor market, are promising approaches for intervening on behalf of workers. Although sectoral employment strategies can vary quite considerably, many share the following characteristics:

- They target an occupation or cluster of occupations within an industry or sector of the economy;
- They seek to become an important and influential actor in that sector; and
- They intervene to benefit low -income workers by connecting individuals to better jobs and by achieving systemic changes in the labor markets that benefit low -income workers more broadly.

Organizations that have demonstrated the ability to achieve systemic change are characterized by five qualities:

- **EXPERTISE:** knowledge of targeted industry and occupations and an understanding of the economic and political factors that affect the targeted sector.
- **LEVERAGE:** ability to influence the behavior of other players.
- **ALLIES:** existence of strong relationships with private and/or public actors within the targeted sector.
- **ADAPTABILITY:** ability to adapt to the ups and downs of the targeted sector, changes in the economic climate, and changes in the political climate.
- **PERSEVERANCE:** sectoral strategies take time to bring about change and often experience setbacks.

Among the 13 observed sectoral employment programs, the main sectoral employment strategies were:

- **TRAINING:** providing workers with the skills needed to either obtain jobs or advance to higher-paying jobs.
- **BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT:** enter the market to compete directly with employers who are not investing in or rewarding their employees.
- **ORGANIZING:** organize employers, residents, workers, and/or other key constituencies to rally support and/or increase the impact of initiatives.
- **RESEARCH AND POLICY ANALYSIS:** provide credible documentation of the positive results certain strategies will have.
- **INTEGRATING STRATEGIES:** one sectoral strategy is rarely ever enough. A combination of several strategies will have the greatest impact.

The sectoral employment programs are Project QUEST, San Antonio, TX; Good Faith Fund, Pine Bluff, AK; Garment Industry Development Corporation, New York, NY; Cooperative Home Care Associates, South Bronx, NY; Primavera Services, Inc., Tucson, AZ; New Hampshire Community Loan Fund, Concord, NH; Working Partnerships USA, San Jose, CA; ARCH Training Center, Inc., Washington, DC; Focus: HOPE, Detroit, MI; Westside Industrial Retention and Expansion Network, Cleveland, OH; Training, Inc., Essex County College, Newark, NJ; Direct Action for Rights & Equality, Providence, RI; and Philadelphia Area Accelerated Manufacturing Education, Inc., Philadelphia, PA.

Employer Practices	Employee Characteristics	Labor Market Functioning	Government Policies
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Industries	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Geography	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input type="checkbox"/> Compensation	<input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand	<input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority	<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories	<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
Qualitative Methods	Qualitative Data	Quantitative Data: Survey	Quantitative Data: Records
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer	<input type="checkbox"/> CPS	<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Employee	<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP	<input type="checkbox"/> WA
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Markets	<input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI	<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Four City	<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- Best Practices
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-21

Authors Mark Elliott, Anne Roder, Elisabeth King, and Joseph Stillman
Title Gearing Up: An interim report on the Sectoral Employment Initiative
Publication Date 2002
Publication Organization Public/Private Ventures

Abstract

The term "sectoral employment" has been used for years to describe the activities of a relatively small group of organizations. In 1998, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation launched a philanthropic effort to test the potential for extending this strategy. Sectoral strategies target an occupation or cluster of occupations within an industry or sector, seek to become influential actors in that sector, and intervene in the sector to benefit low-income workers by connecting individuals to better jobs and by achieving systemic changes in the labor market that more broadly benefit workers. Though the nature, aims and achievements of sectoral employment strategies are diverse, they tend to fall into one of two categories: they seek to alter occupations that offer workers low pay and benefits, or they seek to expand the abilities of low-income workers to qualify for good jobs that ordinarily are out of their reach.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- Best Practices
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-22

Authors John Foster-Bey and Lynette Rawlings
Title Can Targeting Industries Improve Earnings for Welfare Recipients Moving from Welfare-to-Work? Preliminary Findings
Publication Date June 2002
Publication Organization Urban Institute

Abstract

Methodology:

- (1) Study Indicator: the "measuring stick," or dependent variable, is average annual earnings.
- (2) Sample and Data: 18-64 year old single women with children under the age of 18 divided into three groups (each group is subsequently divided into four groups based on educational attainment):
 - Women who received welfare in the previous year to proxy for women who were former welfare recipients.
 - Women who did not receive welfare in the previous year and whose earned income is less than 150 percent of the federal poverty line for a family of three.
 - Women whose earned income is less than 150 percent of the poverty line for a family of three.
- (3) Analytic Approach: Controlling for educational attainment and labor market experience, comparing industry level differences in average earnings within and across the three groups.

Findings:

- (1) Employment distribution for single women with minor children: Industry employment seems determined by educational attainment and not income or welfare status.
- (2) Earnings and education:
 - Welfare recipients moving into the labor market appear to earn less than other single mothers, controlling for education and industry.
 - Education appears to be a good proxy for job skills for all employed single mothers.
 - Welfare status and income appear to be reasonable proxies for labor market experience.
- (3) Relationship between earnings and industry:
 - There are differences in earnings across industries, ceteris paribus.
 - Certain industries (listed in report) provide single mothers with higher than average annual earnings.
- (4) Possible existence of career ladders within industries.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-23

Authors Stephen Freedman, Daniel Friedlander, Gayle Hamilton, JoAnn Rock, Mirisa Mitchell, Jodi Nudelman, Amanda Schweder, and Laura Storto

Title National Evaluation of Welfare to Work Strategies: Evaluating Alternative Welfare-to-Work Approaches: Two-Year Impacts for Eleven Programs

Publication Date June 2000

Publication Organization Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation

Abstract

This report examines 11 programs operated under the JOBS program, which predates TANF. Unlike TANF, these programs did not impose a time limit on eligibility for welfare assistance, but they shared TANF's goals of moving welfare recipients into paid work and off assistance. The programs fell into four categories: employment-focused programs, with first assignments made to job search and a high level of participation mandate enforcement; employment-focused programs, with first assignment made to job search, basic education, or vocational skills training and a high level of participation enforcement; education-focused programs, with first assignments made to basic education or skills training and a high level of participation enforcement; and education-focused programs, with first assignments made to basic education or skills training and a low level of participation enforcement.

Key Findings:

- Many control group members took part in education and training activities on their own initiative. All programs were able to increase participation levels in employment-related activities above the control groups' rate of activity during the two-year follow-up period. The size of the increase was associated with the degree of participation enforcement, but not with the program approach.
- All employment-focused programs produced large increases in job search participation. Some also produced small increases in education and training participation.
- Most education-focused programs raised participation levels in education or training. To a lesser extent, programs also increased job search participation.
- Most programs produced only small increases in work experience or on-the-job training.
- Employment-focused programs produced larger gains in employment over the two-year follow-up period than most of the education-focused programs.
- Employment-focused programs produced much larger gains in earnings over the two year follow-up period than education-focused programs.
- Over time, the employment and earnings gains diminished in most of the employment-focused programs, but increased in most of the education-focused programs. By the end of the follow-up period, some of the education programs had "caught up" to employment programs.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- Best Practices
- Economic Context
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Employment Outcomes

Document TE-24

Author Robert Giloth
Title Learning from the Field: Economic Growth and Workforce Development in the 1990s
Publication Date Summer 2000
Publication Organization Economic Development Quarterly

Abstract

This article provides a broad overview of the history of workforce development efforts, and concludes that "today's workforce development means substantial employer engagement, deep community connects, career advancement, integrative human service supports, contextual and industry-driven education and training, reformed community colleges and a connective tissue of networks."

The article highlights current approaches to and emergent themes in workforce development. Specifically, it discusses the differences between sectoral workforce development approaches and place-based workforce development strategies and suggests that new programs may combine elements of the two.

Other key lessons learned in workforce development discussed are:

- Workforce development is about retention and advancement (and not just placement).
- Workforce development efforts should have a dual customer (employer and employee) focus. They need to attract participants and to be useful and valuable to employers.
- Geography remains a challenge for a successful workforce development efforts. Notable challenges are that labor markets are regional (and not limited by neighborhood boundaries) and, while many low -income jobseekers are inner-city residents, many jobs are located in the suburbs.
- Race matters. While many employees are willing to train workers in certain hard skills, they require workers who will attend consistently, have basic literacy and other "soft skills." Employers often attribute a lack of soft skills to minority communities, particularly black males. In addition, some low -income minority communities are located far from suburban job opportunities, and employers often mistake cultural differences for a lack of basic competencies.
- We have yet to develop a solid understanding of best practices in assessment, training, placement, advancement and retention. Even when likely promising practices are identified, it is difficult to replicate successful workforce development efforts.
- Only by changing the way in which labor markets function (rather than focusing on individuals job programs) can workforce development programs achieve necessary scale and sustainability.

The article also discusses the roles that intermediaries and unions play in workforce development efforts and reviews the ways in which the Workforce Investment Act (enacted in 1998) has impacted workforce development.

<p>Employer Practices</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Employee Characteristics</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Labor Market Functioning</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industries <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geography <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Government Policies</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
<p>Qualitative Methods</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Qualitative Data</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<p>Quantitative Data: Survey</p> <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Quantitative Data: Records</p> <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-25

Authors Anne Gordon and Susanne James-Burdumy
Title Impacts of the Virginia Initiative for Employment Not Welfare
Publication Date January 2002
Publication Organization Mathematica Policy Research

Abstract

This report addresses four questions:

1. How does the Virginia Initiative for Employment Not Welfare (VIEW) component of the Virginia Independence Program (VIP) affect program activities and services used?
2. What economic outcomes are observed for VIEW cases?
3. What is the impact of VIEW on economic outcomes?
4. How does the impact of VIEW vary among the demonstration sites?

Key findings included:

- Before the two-year time limit, VIEW quickly increased employment, largely by increasing the proportion of clients who both worked and received TANF. VIEW had no impact on TANF participation and benefits when averaged across the three sites.
- When the time limit began to affect experimental cases who remained on TANF, TANF participation and benefits were generally lower for experimental cases than for control cases after the time limit took effect or even just before. Although control cases were phased into VIEW during this period, employment effects persisted, and the time limit may be a reason for this.
- VIEW led to a much higher participation rate in employment-preparation activities (job search, for the most part). Although VIEW was expected to lead to lower levels of participation in education and training, the difference was less than expected. VIEW led to more sanctions for not participating in employment services. VIEW also led to higher average employment rates and higher average earnings, and it reduced the percentage of clients on TANF and not working.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective Best Practices Economic Context
 TANF Recipient Perspective Employment Outcomes

Document TE-26

Author	David Gruber
Title	We're Education, You're Semiconductors: Improving Worker Skills Through Employer-Community College Partnerships
Publication Date	January 2002
Publication Organization	Public/Private Ventures

Abstract

This is a guide for employers and training providers developing partnerships with community colleges. It highlights "best practices" in developing, planning, and operating community college training partnerships based on four training initiatives.

Promising practices in partnering with community colleges:

- Employers should look for colleges that are cost-effective and have experience in the targeted training area, the ability to deliver related non-academic supports and services, flexibility, and the faculty and academic capacity to deliver the training.
- After selecting a community college partner, an employer should specify formal training objectives. The college should respond to these objectives with a training model that defines proposed classes, faculty, and logistics. After this, an advisory committee should determine the final training model and oversee the actual training.
- In general, employers' responsibilities include: developing a training plan, setting formal training objectives, setting a budget (per-participant costs in the programs reviewed in this article range from \$44 to over \$8,500) reviewing the final training model, recruiting participants and reviewing operations.
- Though the college assumes primary responsibility for determining the curriculum and program logistics, the final plan must meet employers' needs regarding timing and location.

Lessons learned from the four cases profiled in the guide:

- Community colleges can be well-positioned to meet employers' training needs.
- Employers should seek community colleges that combine capacity, area expertise and flexibility.
- Realizing the advantages of community college training can also mean incurring some program costs and burdens.
- Employers and community colleges need to understand and take on clearly defined roles.
- Partnerships should be managed jointly.
- Large partnerships require a full-time administrator.
- Partnerships should incorporate extensive curriculum planning.
- Curriculum should reflect the workplace.
- Program delivery and teaching should reflect the workplace.
- Program delivery should fit with time and place needs of the employers and workers.
- Partnerships should incorporate supportive services (specifically, career and educational counseling).
- Not all community colleges are able to partner with employers effectively.
- The success of a partnership depends partly on a college's ability to act non-traditionally, i.e. as a partner to a local business.

Employer Practices	Employee Characteristics	Labor Market Functioning	Government Policies
<input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring	<input type="checkbox"/> Skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Industries	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Geography	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input type="checkbox"/> Compensation	<input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand	<input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority	<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories	<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
Qualitative Methods	Qualitative Data	Quantitative Data: Survey	Quantitative Data: Records
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer	<input type="checkbox"/> CPS	<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Employee	<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP	<input type="checkbox"/> WIA
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Markets	<input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI	<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Four City	<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-27

Authors Bill Hangley, Jr., and Anais Loizillon
Title The Transitional Work Corporation: Philadelphia @ Work, an Innovative Welfare-to-Work Strategy for Participants with Substantial Job-Readiness Barriers
Publication Date June 2002
Publication Organization Public/Private Ventures

Abstract

The Transitional Work Corporation's Philadelphia @ Work program functions like a temporary employment agency, hiring welfare recipients and placing them in subsidized, six-month "transitional" jobs in public and non-profit workplaces for 25 hours a week, which satisfies the state welfare law. The workers' wages are paid from Pennsylvania's TANF grant. When the six months are over, TWC helps them find permanent, unsubsidized jobs. The study found that 42 percent percent of those who successfully completed their six-month transitional job moved into unsubsidized jobs.

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| Employer Practices
<input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Compensation
<input type="checkbox"/> Training
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Employee Characteristics
<input type="checkbox"/> Skills
<input type="checkbox"/> Race
<input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Labor Market Functioning
<input type="checkbox"/> Industries
<input type="checkbox"/> Geography
<input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand
<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Government Policies
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| Qualitative Methods
<input type="checkbox"/> Case Study
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Qualitative Data
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer
<input type="checkbox"/> Employee
<input type="checkbox"/> Markets
<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies | Quantitative Data: Survey
<input type="checkbox"/> CPS
<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP
<input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI
<input type="checkbox"/> Four City
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Quantitative Data: Records
<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> WA
<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other |

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-28

Primary Author Harry Holzer
Secondary Author Steven Raphael
Title Employers in the Boom: How Did the Hiring of Unskilled Workers Change during the 1990's?
Publication Date June 2003
Publication Organization Urban Institute

Abstract

This paper examines how employers adjust their hiring practices to accommodate economic boom times and the 'tight' labor markets that typically accompany them. In particular, the study examines proclivity to hiring minorities, the poor, ex-offenders, the wages given and the various methods of screening and skill requirements. Data was gathered through four variations of the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality (MCSUI) Survey that was developed for and administered to employers in various metropolitan areas between 1992-2001. A general increase in demand for lower skilled and minority workers was observed excluding individuals with severe stigmas (e.g. ex-offenders). An increase in wages paid to workers was also observed. These results support the ascertain that employers lower hiring thresholds when workers become less available. Consequentially, the employment prospects for lower-skilled, minority, impoverished and stigmatized individuals seem to be tied to the economic fortunes of the nation.

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| Employer Practices
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Compensation
<input type="checkbox"/> Training
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Employee Characteristics
<input type="checkbox"/> Skills
<input type="checkbox"/> Race
<input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Labor Market Functioning
<input type="checkbox"/> Industries
<input type="checkbox"/> Geography
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand
<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories
<input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Government Policies
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| Qualitative Methods
<input type="checkbox"/> Case Study
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Qualitative Data
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer
<input type="checkbox"/> Employee
<input type="checkbox"/> Markets
<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies | Quantitative Data: Survey
<input type="checkbox"/> CPS
<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MCSUI
<input type="checkbox"/> Four City
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Quantitative Data: Records
<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> WIA
<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other |

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-29

Authors Harry Holzer and Michael Stoll
Title Job Performance and Retention Among Welfare Recipients
Publication Date June 2001b
Publication Organization Urban Institute

Abstract

The study uses a 20-minute telephone survey of approximately 750 establishments in each of four large metropolitan areas: Chicago, Cleveland, Milwaukee, and Los Angeles (Oct 1998 - May 1999) to analyze job performance and retention rates of recently hired welfare recipients. The study focuses on whether or not the employer experienced certain problems with the employee; s subjective employer ratings of worker performance; and employee turnover.

The results indicate that most welfare recipients perform as well or better than employees in comparable jobs, and that their turnover rates appear fairly low. Still, absenteeism is pervasive, and often linked to child care/transportation problems; problems such as poor attitudes towards work and relations with coworkers are observed fairly frequently as well. These problems are strongly related to job performance and retention difficulties, and often plague those who quit as well as those discharged. Several particular characteristics of the workers, their employers and the jobs that they hold are also associated with performance and retention difficulties among working welfare recipients.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-30

Author Harry Holzer
Title "Mismatch in the Low -Wage Labor Market: Job-Hiring Perspective" in *The Low-Wage Labor Market: Challenges and Opportunities for Economic Self Sufficiency*, ed by K. Kaye and D. Nightingale
Publication Date August 2002b
Publication Organization Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, HHS

Abstract

This paper addresses employers' demands for workers in the low-wage labor market, explores a variety of impediments that limit inner-city minority groups' ability to get jobs, and discusses potential policy solutions.

Key findings:

Unskilled workers, particularly inner-city minorities, face a number of barriers on the demand side of the labor market:

- Over two-thirds of employers will not hire individuals who have criminal records. Approximately one-third of all black men have criminal records, and over 60 percent of black male high school dropouts have criminal records.
- Because most jobs require workers to have basic literacy and numeracy, about three-quarters of all non-college jobs require (or strongly prefer) candidates to have high school degrees or GEDs. This is problematic, as over 60 percent of long-term welfare recipients lack their GEDs.
- Low income individuals, and particularly low-income blacks, lack contacts to many potentially good jobs. They may not get information about potential opportunities and have difficulty getting to relatively well-paying suburban jobs.
- Some low-income blacks (particularly those who have criminal records) have extremely limited opportunities in the legal labor market and opt, as a result, to participate in the underground economy.
- When hired, inner-city black applicants are more likely to be hired at larger firms and at jobs that do not involve contact with white customers.

The paper discusses the policy implications of these findings, arguing for:

- Job placement assistance from intermediaries (to address the job "mismatch issues associated with spatial issues and race")
- Improving enforcement of EEO laws
- Job creation for individuals who have difficulty meeting basic private skill sector demands
- Enhancing current wages and benefits as a means to attract and retain workers
- Policies to improve all workers' basic skills and to increase inner city residents' mobility

Employer Practices	Employee Characteristics	Labor Market Functioning	Government Policies
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Industries	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geography	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input type="checkbox"/> Compensation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand	<input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority	<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
Qualitative Methods	Qualitative Data	Quantitative Data: Survey	Quantitative Data: Records
<input type="checkbox"/> Case Study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer	<input type="checkbox"/> CPS	<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Employee	<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP	<input type="checkbox"/> WIA
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Markets	<input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI	<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Four City	<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- Best Practices
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-31

Author Harry Holzer
Title What Employers Want: Job Prospects for Less Educated Workers
Publication Date 1996
Publication Organization Russell Sage Foundation

Abstract

Methodology:

This book presents the results of a survey of employers in four major metropolitan areas of the U.S. The survey was administered to 800 employers in each area as part of the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality.

Key findings from Chapter 3 (What Skills Do Employers Seek, and How Do They Seek Them?):

- Most employers of low -skill/ low -wage workers recruit workers through newspaper ads and referrals from other employees. Less than one-fifth of jobs are filled by walk-ins without referrals. Employers use private employment agencies for roughly 5 to 10 percent of hires.
- Applicants for non-college jobs must pass through a number of screens in order to be hired. Roughly 70 percent of these jobs require some general work experience. About 73 percent require references. Tests (other than physical ones) are used as a screening mechanism in roughly half of all non-college jobs. Interviews are conducted 85-90 percent of the time. Checks on education and/or criminal activity are conducted about 40 percent of the time. Fewer than half of employers would be willing to hire someone with only short-term or part-time work experience.
- About two-thirds of employers will not hire someone with a criminal record. It is not surprising that studies show that individuals who participate in criminal activity and go to jail have significantly more joblessness than those who do not.

Conclusions:

- Depending on our definition of low -skill jobs and geographic area, the percentage of jobs that can be considered low -skill varies from four to 15 percent.
- It is highly likely that the fraction of people in central city areas without the needed education, experience and training substantially exceeds the small fraction of jobs in those areas that require few of these credentials and skills.
- Most of the women transitioning from welfare to work will be competing for a very small fraction of jobs available in the central city.
- For many individuals who transition from welfare to work, the long-term problem will be very low wages and high-turnover on existing jobs, rather than long-term unemployment per se.

Employer Practices <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-32

Author Harry Holzer and Michael Stoll
Title Meeting the Demand: Hiring Patterns of Welfare Recipients in Four Metropolitan Areas
Publication Date May 2001a
Publication Organization The Brookings Institution

Abstract

Welfare recipients are often located far from new low -skill job opportunities. A majority of recently filled jobs for less-skilled workers are located in the suburbs, while most low -income persons reside in the central cities. Suburban employers are more willing than central city employers to hire welfare recipients. Similarly, employer demand for welfare recipients is greater among employers farther away from public transit or poor populations than among those nearby.

Employers in the central city and near public transportation fill higher proportions of their low -skill jobs with welfare recipients. Actual hiring of welfare recipients is over 50 percent higher in jobs in the central cities than in suburbs, and similarly higher among employers within a quarter mile of public transit than those farther away. Black welfare recipients are less likely to be employed in the suburbs than white recipients. Black welfare recipients are about 50 percent more likely to fill jobs in the central city than in the suburbs. White welfare recipients, in contrast, are nearly twice as likely to fill jobs in the suburbs than in the central city.

Employer Practices <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geography <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-33

Authors Harry Holzer and Michael Stoll
Title Employer Demand for Welfare Recipients by Race
Publication Date July 2000
Publication Organization Urban Institute

Abstract

This paper examines the determinants of employer demand for welfare recipients using survey data in four large metropolitan areas. Results suggest high levels of employer demand for welfare recipients, although this demand appears quite sensitive to business cycle conditions. Factors that affect employers' demand for welfare recipients include skill needs, industry, location (suburban businesses are more willing to hire welfare recipients than businesses in in the inner city, but less likely actually to hire them), skill needs, and minority ownership of the business. In addition, results suggest that employers are also less likely to hire welfare recipients who are African American or Latino.

Methodology:

A 20-minute telephone survey was administered to 750 business establishments in each of the following metropolitan areas: Chicago, Cleveland, Milwaukee, and Los Angeles. The survey was administered between October 1998 and May 1999.

Employer Practices <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industries <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCS UI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-34

Authors Harry Holzer and Michael Stoll
Title Job Performance and Retention Among Welfare Recipients
Publication Date June 2001
Publication Organization Urban Institute

Abstract

The study uses a 20-minute telephone survey of approximately 750 establishments in each of four large metropolitan areas: Chicago, Cleveland, Milwaukee, and Los Angeles (Oct 1998 - May 1999) to analyze job performance and retention rates of recently hired welfare recipients. The study focuses on whether or not the employer experienced certain problems with the employee; s subjective employer ratings of worker performance; and employee turnover.

The results indicate that most welfare recipients perform as well or better than employees in comparable jobs, and that their turnover rates appear fairly low. Still, absenteeism is pervasive, and often linked to child care/transportation problems; problems such as poor attitudes towards work and relations with coworkers are observed fairly frequently as well. These problems are strongly related to job performance and retention difficulties, and often plague those who quit as well as those discharged. Several particular characteristics of the workers, their employers and the jobs that they hold are also associated with performance and retention difficulties among working welfare recipients.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-35

Authors V. Joseph Hotz and Charles Mullin
Title Welfare Reform, Employment, and Advancement
Publication Date 2002
Publication Organization Focus, vol. 22, no. 1

Abstract

This article reviews a number of studies of individuals who left welfare during the low-unemployment, EITC-covered period of the 1990s—a time in which leavers might be expected to do comparatively well. It concludes that substantial numbers of "leavers" earn wages below the federal poverty line and that the mere fact of work experience is not a panacea that enables individuals to progress out of poverty.

Accordingly, the authors argue that "the degree to which work will be the primary antidote to poverty will depend on the ability of low-skilled people to maintain employment that .. offers a progression of incomes that allows families to become self sufficient." The article also asserts that "leavers" need a variety of supports and services in order to ensure that their transitions into work enables them to earn enough to escape poverty, highlighting the EITC as one such support.

The article concludes by touching on a variety of other strategies that may help individuals transition out of poverty. It laments that training programs appear an ineffective way to do this, and suggests that programs that embrace employers' perspectives may be effective, as may programs that use intermediaries (such as temporary help agencies).

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-36

Authors	Kellie Isbell, John Trutko, Burt S. Barnow, Demetra Nightingale, and Nancy Pindas
Title	Involving Employers in Training: Best Practices
Publication Date	1996b
Publication Organization	Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, HHS

Abstract

This article provides an overview of employer-based training practices. It includes several key findings regarding the kinds of employees who are most likely to get trained and the types of training that are most popular, and highlights promising practices in getting employer-based training programs started and running.

Methodology:

Literature review and 17 case studies of U.S. companies sponsoring employer-based training (EBT) programs. Nine EBT programs were operated in partnership with JTPA; most of the other eight were private companies operating EBT programs.

Key Findings:

- Whether or not a worker gets training depends on the kind of company for which she works. Large, unionized companies in areas and industries that have low unemployment are more likely to train their workers than other companies.
- Most studies find that between ten and 15 percent of all workers have received formal on-the-job training.
- Certain kinds of workers are more likely than others to receive training. Individuals more likely to receive training from their employers have completed college, are expected to have low -turnover rates, and are male, white and married. Individuals in permanent (not temporary) jobs are also more likely to receive training, as are those in full-time jobs.
- Companies are more likely to offer management skills and computer training than basic skills training.
- Some research suggests that training boosts wages and productivity, but results should be interpreted with caution, as training often is measured inadequately.
- "There are no reliable empirical studies on the effects of training on employee turnover, morale or accidents."
- All companies that partnered with JTPA and were profiled in this study reported that the returns on their customized training programs far outweighed their costs.
- In the JTPA programs profiled, over 80 percent of enrollees completed training and most programs had completion rates of close to 90 percent. Researchers estimate that one reason for this is that most participants were guaranteed jobs if they completed the program.
- There were several barriers to establishing EBT programs for workers. Specifically, small and mid-sized companies may lack the critical mass of workers and resources needed to establish a customized training program.. Some companies are reluctant to make a firm commitment to hiring new EBT programs because they are not certain of the future openings that they will have. In addition, it takes time and effort to establish an EBT. One way in which companies might overcome this hurdle would be to establish consortia of like businesses for the purposes of developing training programs. Authors also posit that employee input is essential to establishing successful training programs.

Employer Practices	Employee Characteristics	Labor Market Functioning	Government Policies
<input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Industries	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Geography	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input type="checkbox"/> Compensation	<input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand	<input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority	<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories	<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
Qualitative Methods	Qualitative Data	Quantitative Data: Survey	Quantitative Data: Records
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer	<input type="checkbox"/> CPS	<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee	<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP	<input type="checkbox"/> WIA
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Markets	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MCSUI	<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Four City	<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-37

Author Jobs for the Future
Title Employer Intermediaries: A Briefing Paper
Publication Date May 1998
Publication Organization Ford Foundation

Abstract

It is important to note that this article was written in the context of the boom economy of the late 1990s. First, this article discusses the ways in which the "new economy" creates labor market and workforce development challenges and opportunities that local intermediary organizations, including employer-initiated intermediaries, have begun to address. Second, the article outlines three major functions intermediary organizations can play to make it easier for employers to find and keep qualified workers. These functions are: organizing and representing employers; brokering services and referring employers to vendors for recruitment, training, support services and other workforce needs; and delivering such services directly. Third, the article presents key challenges and decision points for employer intermediaries as they decide how they will help local employers meet their workforce development needs.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?
 Employer Perspective Best Practices Economic Context
 TANF Recipient Perspective Employment Outcomes

Document TE-38

Author Jobs for the Future
Title Everybody WINS: Effectively Involving Business in Workforce Development
Publication Date June 2001
Publication Organization Jobs for the Future

Abstract

This study rests on a survey of 37 state and local affiliates of the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, all of which were actively engaged in workforce development, and interviews with 13 organizations, some of which also responded to the survey.

Workforce Innovation Networks: Helping employers better meet their workforce needs, particularly under present tight labor markets, and helping low-wage workers connect to jobs and employment-related opportunities that can help them advance toward better-paying, family-supporting jobs.

Due to rising skill demands and work-centered social policies, employers have begun turning to their industry- and broad-based employer organizations for support. A significant number of these organizations have seized upon this opportunity to organize and provide value by helping their members address their labor market needs. Employer organizations are well suited to help employers address these needs. They have access to small and medium-sized employers who typically are inadequately staffed to act aggressively to meet complex labor market needs. They understand business needs and have the ability to translate those needs into language and initiatives that focus on bottom-line results for employers. They also enjoy a high degree of trust from members, a form of political capital that comes from engaging with many of the same employers over time.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-39

Authors Kelleen Kaye and Demetra Nightingale
Title "Overview," in *The Low-Wage Labor Market: Challenges and Opportunities for Economic Sufficiency*, ed. by K. Kaye and D. Nightengale
Publication Date June 2000
Publication Organization Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, HHS

Abstract

This chapter outlines policy interventions affecting low-wage labor markets, as well as barriers to entering the market and opportunities for advancement and benefits.

Key Interventions

- The low-wage market should be able to absorb new entrants if the economy is healthy. The influx of new labor will reduce wages.
- Raising the minimum wage will not help working poor. Most poor adults already make more than the minimum (teenagers are often paid the minimum wage, but they are not considered poor). Raising wage will reduce employer sponsored training.
- The Earned Income Tax Credit is an effective means for increasing labor force participation.
- Employer-targeted tax credits—the Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC) and the Targeted Job Tax Credit (TJTC)—have less favorable results than worker-targeted credits

Barriers

- skills mismatch
- discrimination
- spatial mismatch
- lack of access to informal information networks

Opportunities

- Job turnover is higher in industries where disadvantaged workers tend to find employment, leading to high costs for disadvantaged workers (e.g. more periods of joblessness, reduced opportunities for formal training).

<p>Employer Practices</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Employee Characteristics</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Labor Market Functioning</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Government Policies</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
<p>Qualitative Methods</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Qualitative Data</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<p>Quantitative Data: Survey</p> <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Quantitative Data: Records</p> <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-40

Authors Richard Kazis and Hilary Kopp
Title Both Sides Now: New Directions in Promoting Work and Learning for Disadvantaged Youth
Publication Date July 1997
Publication Organization Jobs for the Future

Abstract

This article discusses Annie E. Casey Foundation's six-city Jobs Initiative that emphasizes the structure of employment and its availability to disadvantaged youth and families. The emphasis of the Initiative is to support innovative projects that address different labor market barriers and opportunities; to encourage a civic agenda around jobs for inner-city residents; to connect these efforts to social service systems reform; and to develop a policy agenda for taking the demonstration to scale.

The report emphasizes:

1. The importance of addressing work preparation, not in isolation but in the context of strategies to lower the multiple barriers that keep many urban youth from succeeding. These include economic, social and psychological barriers that operate on both the supply and demand sides of the labor market. The authors use a "multiple dams" metaphor—we must open all dams to get water to drought-stricken communities (i.e., must address all barriers, not just some).
2. Traditional definitions of work preparation must be broadened significantly for young people to derive maximum benefit in an increasingly competitive and rapidly changing economy.
3. The definition of "work preparation: " to provide adequate preparation and qualifications for sustained labor market participation and lifelong learning so that all young people can move toward economic self-sufficiency and positive engagement as family members and citizens.

Best practices:

1. Youth development:
 - Respect for young people as individuals with experiences and resources.
 - Provision of places where youth can belong and learn.
 - Bringing young people into contact with adults who care about them and hold them to high expectations.
 - Giving youth opportunities to participate in setting rules and expectations and in making operational decisions.
2. Promoting youth leadership in the program and in the community.

Employer Practices	Employee Characteristics	Labor Market Functioning	Government Policies
<input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Industries	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Geography	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input type="checkbox"/> Compensation	<input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand	<input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority	<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories	<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
Qualitative Methods	Qualitative Data	Quantitative Data: Survey	Quantitative Data: Records
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer	<input type="checkbox"/> CPS	<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Employee	<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP	<input type="checkbox"/> WIA
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Markets	<input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI	<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Four City	<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-41

Primary Author Gretchen Kirby
Secondary Author Thomas Fraker
Title Families on TANF in Illinois: Employment Assets and Liabilities
Publication Date June 2003
Publication Organization Mathematica Policy Research

Abstract

Following the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) state welfare caseloads around the nation fell. Illinois garnered recognition for significantly reducing its welfare rolls during this period.

This paper explores the Illinois phenomenon to uncover what lessons can be learned from the experience. Specifically, the paper examines the employment experiences of TANF recipients in Illinois during this period. Furthermore the paper examines the labor market assets and liabilities that TANF recipients. Assets include education; work experience and other factors likely to increase employability while liabilities included personal factors such as mental health and situational factors such as child care responsibilities or housing conditions. Hence the study aimed to outline the characteristics, situations, and employability of TANF recipients.

To accomplish this goal surveys were administered to TANF recipients in Illinois (Cook County) and supplemented with data TANF data from other states.

They found that TANF recipients are more likely to possess characteristics and live in situation that is considered liabilities in the labor market. Limited work experience, health problems, arrests records and child-care problems were negatively associated with employment. Many TANF recipients suffered with multiple liabilities.

The study concludes by outlining the policy relevance of these findings and recommend issues for further research.

- | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Employer Practices
<input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Compensation
<input type="checkbox"/> Training
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Employee Characteristics
<input type="checkbox"/> Skills
<input type="checkbox"/> Race
<input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Labor Market Functioning
<input type="checkbox"/> Industries
<input type="checkbox"/> Geography
<input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand
<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories
<input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Government Policies
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| Qualitative Methods
<input type="checkbox"/> Case Study
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Qualitative Data
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer
<input type="checkbox"/> Employee
<input type="checkbox"/> Markets
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies | Quantitative Data: Survey
<input type="checkbox"/> CPS
<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP
<input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI
<input type="checkbox"/> Four City
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Quantitative Data: Records
<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> WIA
<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other |

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-42

Authors Deborah Kogan and Katherine P. Dickinson
Title Creating Workforce Development Systems that Work: An Evaluation of the Initial One-Stop Implementation Experience
Publication Date August 1997
Publication Organization SPR Associates/U.S. Department of Labor

Abstract
The study examines the progress of the first nine states to implement the One-Stop Center system by describing the implementation experience and identifying the factors that have led to or stood in the way of the key goals of One-Stops: universal access, customer choice, service integration, and accountability for customer outcomes. The study's goal is to evaluate state and local One-Stop systems in the nine states that received One-Stop early implementation grants. The researchers conducted site visits to 14 localities in nine states.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Employer Practices
<input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Compensation
<input type="checkbox"/> Training
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Employee Characteristics
<input type="checkbox"/> Skills
<input type="checkbox"/> Race
<input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Labor Market Functioning
<input type="checkbox"/> Industries
<input type="checkbox"/> Geography
<input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand
<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories
<input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Government Policies
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other |
| Qualitative Methods
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Qualitative Data
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer
<input type="checkbox"/> Employee
<input type="checkbox"/> Markets
<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies | Quantitative Data: Survey
<input type="checkbox"/> CPS
<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP
<input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI
<input type="checkbox"/> Four City
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Quantitative Data: Records
<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> WA
<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other |

- What does this document address?**
- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-43

Authors Deborah Kogan and Kristin Wolff
Title Creating Workforce Development Systems that Work: An Evaluation of the Initial One-Stop Implementation Experience
Publication Date October 1999
Publication Organization SPR Associates/Technical Assistance and Training Corporation /U.S. Department of Labor

Abstract

This report aimed to serve as a "system-building resource" for stakeholders in the welfare-to-work field. SPR conducted interviews with a variety of public agency officials and public interest groups around three issues:

- the potential benefits of welfare reform and workforce development/One-Stop system collaboration at state and local levels;
- the challenges that could impede such collaboration; and
- the informational/TA needs of state and local agencies involved in implementing welfare reform/workforce development collaboration.

Key findings:

- There are important benefits from collaboration for both the welfare and workforce development systems. Benefits include, for example, more efficient use of human, physical, and financial capital resources.
- Persons interviewed for the study identified various approaches to collaboration, from coordination of complementary but distinct services to an entirely integrated service approach.
- While the two social support systems may share some common broad goals, collaboration can be hindered by differing perspectives held by each agency and by real differences in goals, priorities, regulations, and accountability needs of the agencies that run these systems.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-44

Primary Author Peter Kwas and Beth Siegel
Title Jobs and the Urban Poor: Publicly Initiated Sectoral Strategies
Publication Date November 1995
Publication Organization The Aspen Institute, Mt. Auburn Associates Inc.

Abstract

The document addresses sectoral initiatives in general rather than one particular sectoral development initiative. The discussion draws on information gathered from a literature review, interviews with experts, and case studies of 10 initiatives deemed to have "potential to increase economic opportunities for the urban poor."

- (1) "Policy Context:" Evolution of sectoral strategies, advantages and limitations of the sectoral model, characteristics of current initiatives, advantages and limitations of sectoral strategies as an urban anti-poverty tool, and recommendations to the public sector.
- (2) Case study project descriptions:
- Industrial Networks Program, Louisville, Kentucky
 - Minority Participation in Public Works Construction, Portland, Oregon
 - Garment Industry Development Corporation, New York, New York
 - Industry Action Projects, Massachusetts
 - Initiatives in the Advanced Transportation Sector, Los Angeles, California
 - Philadelphia Recycling Consortium, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
 - Skills Training in Manufacturing Metalworking, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 - Life Sciences Strategy, Baltimore, Maryland
 - New York/New Jersey Regional Alliance for Small Contractors
 - Biotechnology Industry Initiative in Massachusetts
- (3) Case study characteristics and project impacts: Brief overview of popular characteristics among the 10 studied initiatives and the impacts of such characteristics as a general economic development and employment strategy.
- (4) Keys to effective sectoral strategies: "developing comprehensive knowledge about the sector" and " using a broad collaborative process."

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industries <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective Best Practices Economic Context
 TANF Recipient Perspective Employment Outcomes

Document TE-45

Author Julia Lane and Kelly Mikelson
Title Pathways to Work for Low -Income Workers: The Effect of Work in the Temporary Help Industry
Publication Date 2002
Publication Organization Urban Institute

Abstract

Methodology:

The authors use several years of CPS data to document differences in characteristics and employment outcomes between temporary help workers and those in traditional work arrangements. They then compare outcomes for low -income and at-risk workers in the temporary help industry with those of similar workers and of nonworkers. (To do this, they use SIPP data and propensity score matching techniques.)

Key findings:

Workers who are at risk of welfare recipiency are more than twice as likely to be in alternative work arrangements as other workers. An examination of outcomes one year later indicates that temporary workers had worse earnings and employment outcomes a year later than did similar individuals working in standard employment. Temporary workers fared substantially better one year later than did those who were initially not employed. Temporary workers were more than twice as likely as these individuals to be working one year later. Although temporary workers do fare worse than those employed in traditional work, their employment outcomes one year later are much closer to standard workers than those of unemployed workers.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-46

Authors Julia Lane and David Stevens
Title Welfare-to-Work Policy: Employer Hiring and Retention of Former Welfare Recipients
Publication Date June 1997
Publication Organization Maryland Governor's Workforce Investment Board, Maryland

Abstract

This article assesses the way in which firms' characteristics (productivity, turnover patterns, policies regarding workforce composition, etc.) impact welfare recipients' ability to get and retain jobs, and, correlatively, to stay off of welfare.

Methodology:

The authors merge two data bases of administrative records as the primary means for conducting their analysis- State of Maryland databases for wage record files and welfare records- to identify industries that tend to hire former welfare recipients and to estimate the effect of firms' characteristics on worker outcomes.

Key findings:

- Only about half of the cohort of 15,535 welfare recipients obtain employment in official channels for which there is data. Of those, fewer than half remain employed consistently after placement (18 percent of the original sample).
- Correlatively, only about 5.7 percent of employers who hire individuals transitioning from welfare to work offer jobs in which workers make "successful" transitions to work.
- Hiring of individuals transitioning from welfare to work was concentrated in 10 clusters: general merchandise (stores), eating and drinking establishments, hotel and other lodging places, personal services, business services, health series, social services, wholesale trade, manufacturing and public administration. The hiring was most intense in business services, health services, and eating and drinking establishments.
- In general, individuals who found jobs in public administration, health services or social services were more likely to experience successful outcomes (jobs lasting more than four quarters and providing exit from what was then AFDC).
- Being hired by a firm that is expanding improves individual chances of success, but being hired as part of a large cluster of welfare recipients is associated with a lower probability of success.

Employer Practices <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-47

Authors Jeannine La Prad and Sharon Sand
Title Integration of Welfare and Workforce Development Systems in the Midwest: Analysis of Implementation
Publication Date December 1999
Publication Organization Corporation for a Skilled Workforce (CSW)

Abstract

This report seeks to understand the relationship between the welfare and workforce development systems in the Midwest. CSW conducted 10 local-level case studies: eight in large urban areas and two in rural areas. Case study data collection consisted of two site visits, with interviews of a range of stakeholders within and outside of the One-Stop Center. The study looks at how state-level WFD systems in the Midwest are structured to meet the needs of TANF clients, and how these state structures translate into local-level activities in ten communities (Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Des Moines, Detroit, Indianapolis, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Steuben County Indiana, and Southwest Wisconsin).

Key findings:

- Separate funding streams for welfare and workforce development efforts—a situation that exists in six of the seven states examined—prevented state-level integration of the two systems' activities.
- At the state level, the authors claim that welfare and workforce development agencies have different priorities, partly in response to recent legislation.
- At the local level, One-Stop Centers vary greatly in the extent to which they serve TANF clients.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-48

Authors David Long, Heather Doyle, and Jean Amendolia
Title The Next Step Jobs Initiative Cost-Effectiveness Analysis: Final Report
Publication Date August 1999
Publication Organization Abt Associates Inc.

Abstract

Report examines cost-effectiveness of the Next Step Jobs initiative, which provided services intended to boost the employment and earnings of supportive housing residents who earlier had been homeless or at risk of homelessness. Several of the nine program sites utilized labor market intermediaries in training and placing participants.

Methodology

The study used multivariate statistical analysis to compare Next Step participants to comparison group members, controlling for demographic and background differences between the groups. Impact estimates were valued in dollars and compared to the costs of the services.

Findings:

- More than half the cost of Next Step employment services falls into one of three categories:
 - (1) Job development and placement - job search assistance, job coaching, developing employment and training relationships with employers, referrals to positions in the regular job market.
 - (2) On-site training, occupational skills training, and on the job training provided at the sites themselves.
 - (3) In-house employment—employment with the site's sponsoring agency and any businesses it operates, on-site internships and sheltered workshops —produced useful goods and services.
- The demonstration's services substantially increased the employment and earnings of supportive housing residents.
- Residents' dependence on SSI, SSDI, and General assistance payments were significantly reduced.
- Next Step services were found to be cost-effective from the standpoint of residents, government, and society as a whole.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-49

Author Lisa Lynch
Title Developing Intermediaries and the Training of Low -Wage Workers
Publication Date August 2001
Publication Organization National Bureau of Economic Research

Abstract

This publication discusses the concept of employer intermediaries and discusses ways in which intermediaries can be structured to ensure maximal benefits for workers and employers. In addition to reviewing articles and surveys that describe the current (2001) labor market (which was extremely tight), it also reviews several intermediary organizations/ projects. (All of these projects focus on meeting the needs of more than one employer.)

Key points:

- The nature of training (cost to employers and employees) and low -skill workers can result in market failure. (Training, though valued both by employers and employees, isn't provided at all, because neither party is willing to invest sufficient resources in it. Employers, for example, fear that trained employees will leave their positions.)
- Labor market institutions, especially unions, can play an important role in ensuring that there is not market failure in training (i.e., it doesn't get paid for) and move the country towards a "higher training equilibrium" (more folks will get trained to the benefit of all).
- In order to be effective, intermediaries must act as brokers between employers and workers in the provision of skills, have the ability to enforce contractual agreements over multiple periods, be able to monitor the quality of training, and, finally, have the capacity to go to scale. Training intermediaries should be structured so that there is co-determination, co-investment and certification of training. (Here, the "co"- refers to both employers and employees or employee groups.)
- Unions can serve as effective intermediaries.
- Emerging labor market intermediaries face several common challenges, especially funding. As programs are pushed to become self-sufficient (i.e. lose foundation and/or federal funding) they may lose their focus on disadvantaged workers. In addition, it is much easier for intermediaries to attract employer participation (and placement) in tight labor markets.

<p>Employer Practices</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Employee Characteristics</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Labor Market Functioning</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Government Policies</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
<p>Qualitative Methods</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Qualitative Data</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<p>Quantitative Data: Survey</p> <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Quantitative Data: Records</p> <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-50

Authors Richard McGahey and Kendra Lodewick
Title Interim Report on the TechReach Project
Publication Date May 2003
Publication Organization Abt Associates Inc.

Abstract

This is an interim report on the TechReach initiative, a project led by the largest national temporary staffing agency, Manpower, Inc., and funded by the Ford Foundation. Through TechReach, Manpower aims to apply its business model to serve economically disadvantaged individuals and those transitioning from welfare to work. In partnership with community-based organizations, Manpower has launched a project to train these individuals and to place them in the information technology sector.

The report describes the implementation of the TechReach project, including key project goals and planned strategies. Because it is an interim report, it does not include outcome information for project participants.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-51

Authors Richard McGahey and Catherine Dun Rappaport
Title Evaluation of Phase III of the Workforce Innovations Networks Demonstration: Interim Report
Publication Date April 2003
Publication Organization Abt Associates Inc.

Abstract

This interim report describes the first half of Phase III of the Workforce Innovations Networks (WINs) project. Through WINs, several national organizations—the Center for Workforce Preparation at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Center for Workforce Success at the National Association of Manufacturers, and Jobs for the Future—provided funding to nine demonstration sites to launch employer-focused workforce development projects.

The report documents the sites' and the national organizations' progress to date. It details the national organizations' "theories of change" (or logic models) for achieving improved worker and employer outcomes and describes the steps that the organizations and sites have taken to launch dual customer focused workforce development efforts. It does not, however, include concrete results for workers in terms of placement, retention or advancement, because the organizations and sites were still in the process of implementing their projects at the time of the report.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-52

Authors James L. McIntire and Amy L. Robins
Title A Best Practices Assessment of One-Stop Job Centers Working With Welfare Recipients
Publication Date 1999
Publication Organization Fiscal Policy Center, University of Washington

Abstract

Unlike other research efforts, this study deals directly with the effectiveness of One-Stops in serving welfare clients. This study seeks to discover effective practices and to understand One-Stop Centers' potential for moving people from welfare to self-sufficiency. Data collection efforts included review of administrative data as well as interviews and focus groups at five exemplary One-Stop Centers.

Key findings:

The following administrative features contribute to the sites' success:

- Service integration led to higher retention of clients within the One-Stop;
- Colocation of services improved clients' relationships with welfare staff. Also, the study found no adverse stigmatizing effects of colocation on non-welfare clients of the One-Stop; and
- Individualized attention was associated with greater client achievement of self-sufficiency.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- Best Practices
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-53

Author Karin Martinson
Title Literature Review on Service Coordination and Integration in the Welfare and Workforce Development Systems
Publication Date January 1999
Publication Organization Urban Institute

Abstract

This literature review examines 16 studies, written from 1989 to 1998, which investigate the coordination and integration of welfare and workforce development services. The review argues that various research efforts in welfare and workforce development system integration do not point to a clear model of successful service coordination. The review finds various benefits to coordination based on older studies (1991, 1993), including, for example, increased access to services for clients of both systems, and efficiency for public agencies through reduced duplication.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-54

Authors	Jack Mills and Richard Kazis
Title	Business Participation in Welfare-to-Work:Lessons from the United States (Prepared for the Business Forum on Welfare -to-Work: Lessons from America 20-21 January 1999; London)
Publication Date	January 1999
Publication Organization	The New Deal Task Force and the Rockefeller Foundation

Abstract

The article reviews the history of workforce development efforts in the U.S., describes the experiences of several leading U.S. firms, and identifies both challenges and promising practices in helping individuals transition from welfare to work.

Key findings:

- (1) Hiring of welfare recipients by U.S. firms has grown rapidly. According to employer surveys, more than half of U.S. firms report having hired welfare recipients.
- (2) Most welfare recipients are hired by a small number of large (100+ employee) firms.
- (3) Welfare recipients are more likely to be hired in the service and retail sectors (80 percent of welfare hires are employed in these sectors.)
- (4) The primary motivation for employer participation in welfare to work (WtW) activities is to meet business objectives.
- (5) Most welfare recipients are hired into low -wage jobs, and turnover rates in these jobs is high.
- (6) Employers report challenges in expanding their WtW efforts. Specifically,
 - Not all local service providers are able to customize their activities to meet employers' specific needs.
 - There is a need for quality referrals and better screening of potential hires.
 - Employers fear that local welfare and workforce development agencies will be inflexible and challenging to work with.
 - It may take more time and resources than employers have to develop new programs.
 - It can be complex for firms' extant HR offices to provide the range of supports and services that former welfare recipients may need.
- (7) Despite these challenges, employers remain interested in WtW and are particularly interested in strategies geared to increase retention.

The article identifies several "lessons learned" in engaging businesses in workforce development. Those lessons are as follows:

- (1) Successful initiatives require strategic planning and high levels of corporate commitment.
- (2) Partnerships with local service providers can facilitate the hiring and retention of former welfare recipients.
- (3) Companies often find it helpful to integrate efforts for welfare recipients into their overall human resources practices.

Employer Practices <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-55

Authors Jack Mills and Heath Prince
Title Employer-Led Organizations and Career Ladders: Linking Worker Advancement with the Skill Needs of Employers (*part of a series of reports on engaging employers in workforce development*)
Publication Date February 2003
Publication Organization Jobs for the Future

Abstract

This document explains the concept of “career ladders” and discusses key processes involved in creating them. It discusses not only intra-firm career ladders, but inter-firm industry specific and cross-industry career ladders, as well. Cross-firm career ladders can be managed by employer organizations or other business collaboratives. The brief argues that employer organizations are particularly well suited to manage career ladders and that so doing can benefit employer organizations.

The authors identify several promising practices in developing career ladders. According to the authors, effective career ladders should (1) respond to employers' needs for skills (be demand driven), (2) identify and document skills that can be transferred from one company and/or industry to another, (3) have many rungs for advancement, and (4) foster effective partnerships among involved companies. The piece concludes with a preliminary "how to" guide for interested parties.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-56

Authors Philip Moss and Chris Tilly
Title Stories Employers Tell: Race, Skill, and Hiring in America
Publication Date 2001
Publication Organization Russell Sage Foundation

Abstract

Methodology:

In addition to using data from the MCSUI for this book, the authors conducted in-depth in-person interviews with employers in Detroit, L.A., Atlanta and Boston. (As part of the MCSUI, Harry Holzer conducted telephone interviews with employers in these same four cities.) They also reviewed relevant literature.

Key points from Chapter 3 (*The Skills Employers Seek*):

- Employers' "skill" distinctions often incorporate racially discriminatory attitudes.
- Over the past 10 years, there has been an increase in requirements for basic skills, particularly computer related ones and for soft skills. That said, there has not been an enormous increase in these requirements as some studies suggest. Instead, there has been a dramatic increase in employers' focus on "soft skills." This focus can be problematic, as employers' perceptions of soft skills are subjective, and cultural and racial differences may affect employers' assessment.
- All hard skill requirements have sizable impacts on the likely race (and education level, and in most cases, gender) of the person hired. Credential requirements have more modest effects. Almost every task of credential requirement is associated with reduced hiring of blacks and Latinos relative to whites of the same gender.
- The majority of employers in face-to-face interviews asserted that "soft skills" were the most important qualities they sought.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-57

Authors Philip Moss and Chris Tilly
Title Raised Hurdles for Black Men: Evidence from Interviews with Employers
Publication Date November 1995
Publication Organization Russell Sage Foundation

Abstract

The authors explore four hypotheses regarding the worsening labor market position of black men:
(1) Employers' shift in location away from areas that are heavily African American
(2) Increased skill needs of businesses that may disadvantage African American men
(3) Growing adoption of screening and recruiting procedures that exclude African American men
(4) Negative employer perceptions of potential African American male employees.

Based on a series of interviews with 56 employers in Detroit and Los Angeles, the authors find some evidence in support of each hypothesis.

Employer Practices <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industries <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

Employer Perspective Best Practices Economic Context
 TANF Recipient Perspective Employment Outcomes

Document TE-58

Authors Demetra Smith Nightingale and Russell Jones
Title The Structural Link Between JTPA and State Welfare Reform Programs in 1997
Publication Date December 1997
Publication Organization The Urban Institute

Abstract

This report pre-dates the enactment and implementation of WIA. The report provides background on welfare reform and discusses the changes resulting from PRWORA (1996). It discusses JTPA and other workforce development programs in existence at the time the report was written, touches on their integration with welfare agencies prior to welfare reform, and speculates about a workforce development model and the influence of the "One-Stop service" concept. This report aimed to provide a general description of the extent to which welfare-to-work efforts (as of the summer of 1997) are structurally integrated with the employment and training system (JTPA) at the state level, and thereby document whether there have been major state-level reorganizations related to welfare reform. Recent and ongoing (as of 1997) studies were reviewed. Telephone discussions were held with DOL federal representatives and JTPA officials in selected states.

Key finding: The report found at the time of the study that only a few states had made or were making major changes to the way they structured the administration of the TANF work programs. They note that while there may be major government reorganization associated with welfare reform in the future, dramatic restructuring as of the summer of 1997 had been rare.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-59

Authors Daniel O'Shea and Christopher T. King
Title The Workforce Investment Act of 1998: Restructuring Workforce Development Initiatives in States and Localities
Publication Date April 2001
Publication Organization The Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government

Abstract

This report examines some of the challenges that states and localities face in WIA implementation, and also informs the larger political debate on devolution. The report also analyzed federal WIA legislation, then evaluated its implementation. Data collection included site visits and interviews in three states: Tennessee, Texas, and Washington. The study assessed preparedness for WIA implementation and states' implementation experiences. Since the summer and fall of 1999, the researchers have continued to track WIA implementation, including reviewing state monitoring reports, policy directives, technical assistance guides, and related documents. Ongoing research is supplemented by discussions with policymakers, practitioners, and researchers. This report does not focus on TANF/WIA coordination or on TANF services, but rather on experiences with early WIA implementation in general.

Key challenges to WIA implementation:

- Building partnerships and establishing proportional fiscal responsibility for One-Stop service delivery.
- The tension between the Work First approach and access to more intensive education and training services.
- The uses of information technology, performance measures, and provider eligibility criteria.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-60

Author	Paul Osterman
Title	"Employers in the Low -Wage/Low -Skill Labor Market," in <i>Low Wage Workers in the New Economy</i> , ed. by R. Kazis and M. Miller
Publication Date	2001
Publication Organization	Urban Institute Press

Abstract

This chapter provides an overview of the low -wage labor market (offering a variety of definitions for that market); discusses skill requirements, hiring practices, and wages for employment in the low -wage labor market, and offers a variety of policy options for changing employer behavior such that there are opportunities for low -wage workers to advance into more lucrative positions.

Key points are as follows:

- It is difficult to come up with a comprehensive definition of the low -wage labor market, as it includes a broad range of individuals, including teenage fastfood workers, adult sweatshop laborers, and everything in between.
- Skill requirements in the labor market as a whole are increasing, though there also are projections for substantial increases in jobs that require high school training or less. Even those jobs, however, require increasing levels of skill from employees.
- Soft skills are very important in the low -skill labor market.
- Black and Hispanic men are consistently less likely than white men to hold skilled jobs. One reason for this may be that employers often believe that minority males are less trustworthy than others. Employers are particularly hostile towards Black men.
- Individuals employed in low -wage jobs are not very mobile. Many remain trapped in low income jobs over the course of their professional lives.
- Four ways to influence employers' behavior in the low -skill labor market (to improve potential outcomes for workers) are: standard setting (minimum wage, etc.), union organization, building new labor market intermediaries, and providing firms with incentives to improve opportunities for their workers.

<p>Employer Practices</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Employee Characteristics</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Labor Market Functioning</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Government Policies</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
<p>Qualitative Methods</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Qualitative Data</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<p>Quantitative Data: Survey</p> <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Quantitative Data: Records</p> <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-61

Authors Greg Owen and Amy Bush Stevens
Title Whose Job is It? Employers' Views on Welfare Reform
Publication Date May 2000
Publication Organization Joint Center for Poverty Research

Abstract

This paper highlights selected results from interviews with Minnesota employers involved in welfare to work (WtW) partnerships with local social service agencies and other community members. Employers were asked about their hiring practices, perceptions of welfare (MFIP) workers, benefit requirements and the advancement opportunities they offered workers.

Methodology:

Qualitative telephone interviews with 130 Minnesota employers who participated in local WtW partnerships. Sample was not representative of Minnesota employers in that it included only those who had chosen to participate in some sort of community WtW partnerships.

Key findings:

- Few differences emerged between urban/suburban and rural employers, although urban/suburban businesses appeared more affected by tight labor markets and more open to flexible hiring practices.
- Employers identified lack of soft skills as the primary barrier to welfare recipients' participation in the labor force. Welfare recipients identified structural barriers such as low wages and lack of education and child care as their primary barriers.
- Employers reported that participating in local partnerships was valuable in helping them to recruit and retain WtW employees.

Employer Practices <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-62

Authors	Diane Paulsell and Ali Stieglitz
Title	Employment Retention and Advancement: Pennsylvania's Experience with Performance Goals
Publication Date	October 2001
Publication Organization	Mathematica Policy Research

Abstract

This is a study of Pennsylvania Community Solutions initiative, a statewide effort to provide job placement and employment retention services to TANF participants, which operated from 1998-2001.

Findings

- Service providers enrolled only half the planned number of participants.
- Only 44 percent of those enrolled were placed in full-time jobs compared to the goal of 65 percent. Less than half were offered medical benefits within the first six months (the State's goal was 60 percent).
- Contractors received 12-month retention bonuses for only 11 percent of those placed in jobs.

Reasons for program not meeting performance goals:

- Pennsylvania's TANF caseload dropped after Community Solutions was implemented, which reduced pool of applicants and made it difficult for contractors to enroll original number.
- The Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare established goals higher than TANF's, which resulted in state caseworkers and Community Solutions staff providing inconsistent messages about work requirements and the types of jobs participants should seek.
- Many programs could not generate enough income under benchmark-based payment system to maintain adequate staffing.

Conclusions:

- Paying service providers based solely on individual participant outcomes is complex and may jeopardize providers' financial viability.
- Communicating a consistent message to participants about state performance goals is important

<p>Employer Practices</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Employee Characteristics</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Labor Market Functioning</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Government Policies</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
<p>Qualitative Methods</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Qualitative Data</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<p>Quantitative Data: Survey</p> <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Quantitative Data: Records</p> <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-63

Authors LaDonna Pavetti, Michelle Derr, Jacquilyn Anderson, Carole Trippe, and Sidnee Pashal
Title The Role of Intermediaries in Linking TANF Recipients with Jobs
Publication Date February 2000
Publication Organization Mathematica Policy Research

Abstract

This document discusses the role of intermediaries in the welfare to work process. An intermediary is defined as an organization responsible for linking TANF recipients with jobs through a formal relationship with the state or local entity responsible for the administration of TANF or WtW employment programs. A broad range of organizations act as intermediaries for welfare recipients, including non-profits (which account for 67 percent of the total), for-profit companies, educational institutions, and government or quasi-government agencies. For-profit companies account for a relatively small share of all intermediaries, but they serve large numbers of TANF recipients. In fact, they expect to serve almost half of all TANF recipients who are referred to an intermediary organization for services.

In terms of implementation, the path that a TANF recipient takes to get to an intermediary can be a simple referral or a complex chain of referrals. The referral process is often tightly defined and monitored to enforce participation requirements and achieve high work participation, which makes it difficult for intermediaries outside the primary TANF employment system to receive referrals. Intermediaries that provide job search and placement assistance to welfare recipients differ little in the specific services they provide, although they differ in their approach.

The report notes that roles between the numerous organizations should be clearly defined in order to provide an efficient system for welfare recipients. It also mentions that intermediaries struggle with a high no-show rate amongst TANF recipients referred to them, and the flow of clients is rarely steady and predictable.

<p>Employer Practices</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Employee Characteristics</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Labor Market Functioning</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Government Policies</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
<p>Qualitative Methods</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Qualitative Data</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<p>Quantitative Data: Survey</p> <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Quantitative Data: Records</p> <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-64

Authors LaDonna Pavetti and Michelle Derr
Title Changing the Culture of the Welfare Office: The Role of Intermediaries in Linking TANF Recipients with Jobs
Publication Date September 2001
Publication Organization Economic Policy Review

Abstract

This study examines the characteristics of intermediary organizations and explores the roles they play in linking welfare recipients to jobs. Intermediaries, in this article, are defined as entities that (1) provide services that link welfare recipients to jobs and (2) have formal relationships with local welfare offices or other related agencies.

Methodology:

Case studies of twenty sites (ten urban, ten rural). Each site served between 500 and 1000 families at the time of selection.

Key findings:

- In the sites examined, the majority of intermediary organizations were well-established nonprofit organizations. For-profit companies account for a small share of intermediaries in the sites studied. However, because most for-profit intermediaries serve large numbers of clients, they are expected to serve almost half of the TANF recipients who are referred to all intermediaries.
- Most sites transfer some responsibility for providing employment related services to intermediaries.
- Most sites reimburse intermediaries on a cost-reimbursement basis.
- There is wide variation in the amount that intermediaries are paid for their services.
- Though intermediaries provide the same kinds of services, they differ in the way in which they structure their job search programs, link clients with ancillary services and the extent to which they provide post-placement supports.

Lessons learned:

- Key to successes in working with intermediaries is establishing clear roles and responsibilities for each partner.
- Transferring data between agencies and intermediaries can be difficult.
- As caseloads decline, intermediaries are concerned that there is a mismatch between the levels of services that they are being asked to provide and the needs of clients they are being asked to serve.
- The decisions organizations make regarding how much responsibility to transfer to intermediaries affects the type of organizations that are qualified to serve in that capacity.

<p>Employer Practices</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Employee Characteristics</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Labor Market Functioning</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Government Policies</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
<p>Qualitative Methods</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Qualitative Data</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<p>Quantitative Data: Survey</p> <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Quantitative Data: Records</p> <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-65

Authors LaDonna Pavetti and Debra Strong
Title Work-Based Strategies for Hard-to-Employ TANF Recipients: A Preliminary Assessment of Program Models and Dimensions
Publication Date May 2001
Publication Organization Mathematica Policy Research

Abstract

This largely descriptive qualitative study reviews 65 programs geared to help individuals who receive TANF to transition from welfare to work.

Methodology:

To conduct this assessment, the authors interviewed key program staff at each program and conducted some site visits.

Key findings:

- (1) All of the programs fit into one of four distinct typologies:
- Paid work experience programs (in which programs ran businesses and employed TANF recipients)
 - Supported, transitional, publicly funded jobs programs (in which programs helped participants to find employment in paid temporary positions at outside agencies and companies, subsidize participant wages with welfare to work or TANF funds, and provide participants with social service supports geared to help them remain in jobs)
 - Supported transitional structured employment programs (in which programs place participants in "forgiving" work environments prior to placing them in competitive employment and provide intensive personal and employment supports for as long as they are needed)
 - Supported competitive employment programs in which participants are placed directly into competitive employment and provided with a variety of post placement job coaching and case management services.
- (2) Each program model is not necessarily designed to meet the diverse needs of all hard-to-employ TANF recipients.
- (3) Although all four models are distinct from traditional welfare employment programs, each shares the general goals of welfare employment programs. Specifically the programs described are focused on providing clients with more extensive support than do traditional TANF and Welfare-to-Work programs. Despite this difference, as with more traditional programs, they aim to help participants enter the paid labor market as quickly as possible. Most aim to place clients in paid competitive employment within 90 days.
- (4) According to most program staff, the programs identified could be replicated in other communities and extant programs could be expanded if they received additional referrals from local welfare offices and/ or additional funding.
- (5) There is limited information about the outcomes and effectiveness of these programs.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-66

Authors Nancy Pindus and Robin Koralek
Title Coordination and Integration of Welfare and Workforce Development Systems
Publication Date March 2000
Publication Organization Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, HHS

Abstract

This case study report seeks to understand how welfare recipients receive employment-related services. The case study visits were conducted in Missouri (2), Ohio (3), Oregon (2), Pennsylvania (2), Rhode Island (1), and South Carolina (2). The study primarily addresses local operational interactions between the TANF program and the workforce development program by observing local service delivery across both programs. The study finds that a variety of job services are available to TANF participants, including pre-employment, employment, and post-employment services. Many agencies can be involved in service provision for TANF clients. Those services most likely to be kept within the TANF agency are those directly related to cash provision, including eligibility determination and sanctioning. Services such as case management and support services were usually shared by several agencies. Finally, specialized employment services were usually provided by other public or private agencies.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective	<input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices	<input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective	<input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes	

Document TE-67

Authors	Tony Proscio and Mark Elliott
Title	Getting In, Staying On, Moving Up: A Practitioner's Approach to Employment Retention
Publication Date	2000
Publication Organization	Public/Private Ventures

Abstract

Moving Up is an employment program operated by New York's Vocational Foundation, Inc (VFI). While the Moving Up employment program can be considered a comprehensive employment program with efforts to educate, train and place young people in jobs, the program prides itself on helping participants keep those jobs. Most Moving Up participants possess academic skills far below the standard for their age level, have dropped out of school, have little to no work history, have few occupational skills, and their interpersonal skills are more likely to undermine than promote any progress in the workplace.

Once enrolled into the program, students attend a five-month course of remedial math and reading classes, computer instruction, GED preparation and job-readiness training. Before the training is completed, students begin working with career advisors and job developers to locate full-time employment. Once employed, students continue to receive assistance from VFI in the form of case management, mediation/counseling and job upgrade assistance for up to two years after initial job placement.

The Moving Up program works hard to acclimate participants with the environment and culture of the workplace. Participants are expected to commute daily (five days a week) to VFI's main office in Manhattan for seven hours per day. They must punch a time clock, wear appropriate business attire, and follow typical workplace protocol. In return, participants receive a bimonthly "paycheck," which is a combination of transportation and food stipends.

Eighty percent of those placed are still employed after three months; 62 percent are employed after one year and 53 percent are employed after two years, with lower retention rates among groups who are particularly difficult to serve (e.g., teen mothers on welfare and participants with health/drug problems). Follow-up data, collected by VFI, also shows signs that participants are moving up (as measured by pay increases) and 32 percent of participants have earned a GED after enrollment.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-68

Primary Author Nan Poppe
Secondary Author Julie Strawn
Title Whose Job Is It? Creating Opportunity for Advancement
Publication Date June 2003
Publication Organization Center for Law and Social Policy

Abstract

This paper is a literature review of the most current research on the subject of career advancement for low-income individuals. The goal is to uncover effective methods and issues surrounding helping low-wage workers advance in the labor market. Factors that are most related to worker advancement including, education, access to quality employment opportunities, and gender are identified. The policy implications of these factors for workforce development intermediaries are then explored and strategies for more effective interventions are outlined. These strategies are described in further detail through a more in-depth examination of the research. Policy recommendations are then drawn from these research examples in order to overcome key challenges experienced by the workforce intermediaries studied.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-69

Authors Mark Ragan and Richard Nathan
Title Welfare Reform and the Development of Comprehensive Human Service System
Publication Date August 2002
Publication Organization The Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government

Abstract

This report seeks to document the lessons of integration of human service systems at localities in various states. The researchers conducted case study visits to 30 sites in 11 states that illustrated early progress in developing comprehensive service systems. The paper investigates how welfare reform altered the policy environment of local service operations and develops an analytic framework for determining levels of integration. The study describes structural and procedural strategies for improving service delivery, identifies factors that contribute to integration, and assesses the effects of service integration. The project is based on the premise that human service systems historically comprise a patchwork of separate programs that provide complementary, and sometimes overlapping, services to the same population with little communication, coordination, or integration across programs. The report claims that limited research exists on the effectiveness of integrated service delivery.

Additional research needed:

- How common are comprehensive services systems?
- What difference in outcomes does it make to deliver services in a more cohesive manner?

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- Best Practices
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-70

Author Ida Rademacher
Title Working with Value: Industry-Specific Approaches to Workforce Development: A Synthesis of Findings
Publication Date 2002
Publication Organization The Aspen Institute

Abstract

This report discusses sectoral workforce development strategies and includes outcome information for participants in several sectoral workforce development programs. It also highlights some findings from case study field research with employers.

Methodology:

- Three-year study that tracked the earnings and employment of 732 low-income individuals who participated in one of six industry-based workforce development programs.
- Review of case study field research in which employers and industry leaders "recognized the value" of services offered by workforce development initiatives.

Key Points/ Findings:

- Among sectoral program participants who participated in program surveys (n= 732 at baseline; 371 for year two follow-up), annual median income rose from a baseline of \$8,580 to \$17,732, two years after program completion. The percentage of survey completers employed at some time during the past year rose from 74 percent to 94 percent, in the second year after training and the percentage of responders who were employed year round rose from 23 percent to 66 percent.
- Participants' benefits improved over this time period as well.
- Some employers find that the quality of their workforce improves as a result of employees' participation in training offered through sectoral initiatives.
- Some employers believe that sectoral workforce development programs help them to tap into different population pools and to secure new sources of talent for difficult to fill positions.
- Sectoral workforce development programs can lead to expanded markets for business partners.
- Advocacy by sector programs can lead to industry retention and the improvement of operating conditions for businesses.

Promising practices:

- Sectoral workforce development programs should develop effective screening processes that build on industry knowledge.
- Training content and culture should reflect industry norms.
- Successful programs often are designed such that they can be effective for program participants who have different educational backgrounds and skill levels.
- Tailored and flexible support for participants during and after training is key.
- Sectoral workforce development initiatives should focus on "selling" themselves to businesses (and should not present themselves as "charity cases").

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-71

Author Anu Rangarajan
Title The Road to Sustained Employment: Lessons from a U.S. Job Retention Initiative
Publication Date June 2002
Publication Organization Mathematica Policy Research

Abstract

The Post-Employment Services Demonstration (PESD) was a national experiment to test a case management-based approach to promoting job retention, and was evaluated using a rigorous experimental design. The evaluation findings show that, although the programs were well implemented, they did little to improve employment outcomes for those served by the programs.

PESD case managers provided 5 key services to program participants: (1) counselling and support, (2) job search assistance, (3) help resolving eligibility and other benefit issues, (4) service referrals for special needs, and (5) enhanced support services payment for work-related expenses. The PESD intervention was based on a conceptually sound approach to providing services to newly employed welfare recipients and was well implemented. Yet, the programs as a whole did little to increase earnings, reduce welfare, or promote self-sufficiency.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-72

Author Anu Rangarajan
Title Ten Lessons Learned from the Post-Employment Services Projects (based on a 1996 report entitled *Taking the First Steps: Helping Welfare Recipients Who Get Jobs Keep Them*)
Publication Date 2001
Publication Organization Mathematica Policy Research/Administration for Children and Families, HHS

Abstract

The Post-Employment Services Program Demonstration (PESD) operated programs geared to help welfare recipients not just get jobs but also to retain them. These programs operated from 1994-1996 in five locales across the country. A key component of the program was extended case management services. As part of this demonstration, 2,500 welfare recipients received PESD services and 2,500 received standard JOBS services.

Lessons learned:

- Thirty to 40 percent of PESD clients were unemployed 12 months post-placement.
- Most clients ended up in low-paying jobs with poor benefits and little potential for growth. Most were employed at jobs that paid \$5/hour or less and were in the service sector.
- Most jobs required low-level skills.
- Factors that made the transition from welfare to work difficult include child care, transportation, budget pressures, and the need to develop an understanding of the workplace.
- It is important to focus on job retention as a strategy for helping individuals transition from welfare to work.
- In order to promote retention, states can (1) make welfare recipients more aware of transitional benefits assistance, (2) simplify the paperwork process so that it's easier for welfare recipients to access those benefits, and (3) provide individuals who lose their jobs with job assistance so that those individuals don't end up back on welfare.
- Not all clients use extended case management systems; a challenge is identifying those individuals who will benefit from extended case management services and providing those services to them.
- Transitional benefits should be made more available and accessible to individuals transitioning from welfare to work.
- Newly employed welfare recipients need increased access to child care.
- Welfare recipients need greater awareness of workplace culture and norms and acceptable work behavior.
- Individuals who lose their jobs should not have to go back on welfare to get quick and easy access to employment services.
- Inter- and intra-agency communications need to be improved in order to facilitate clients' access to necessary benefits.
- A system that promotes job retention must be flexible enough to respond to clients' varied needs.
- Emergency assistance programs could help clients address emergency situations to help newly employed individuals retain their jobs.

Employer Practices <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CPS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective Best Practices Economic Context
 TANF Recipient Perspective Employment Outcomes

Document TE-73

Authors	Marsha Regenstein and Jack Meyer
Title	Job Prospects for Welfare Recipients: Employers Speak Out in New Federalism: Issues and Options for States (Series A, No. A-25)
Publication Date	August 1998
Publication Organization	Urban Institute

Abstract

Methodology:

- Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI) surveyed 500 businesses at the establishment level (individual plants, stores, or offices) in industries likely to have larger than average numbers of entry-level workers. The ESRI sample consists largely of small employers that employ fewer than 50 workers even though the authors over-sampled companies with 100 or more employees. (Before launching this large survey, they conducted a small exploratory survey of 25 telephone interviews with employers.)
- 200 additional interviews were conducted with employers (100 in Los Angeles and 100 in Milwaukee) to assess whether those cities differed significantly from that of national responses.

Key findings:

- Employers are most concerned with hiring entry-level workers that have positive attitudes and are reliable. They are less concerned that workers possess job-specific skills and training.
- Most employers are unaware of government supports for welfare workers (taxcredits, child care subsidies, etc.).
- Employers are more interested in government programs that will help them to screen applicants than programs that offer employers monetary benefits for hiring welfare recipients.
- Sixty-two percent of employers nationwide have hired welfare recipients. This number is higher for the restaurant industry (71 percent).
- Of those employers that have hired welfare recipients, 70 percent assert that welfare recipients are friendly and dress appropriately for work.
- Employers that have not hired welfare recipients have poorer perceptions of welfare recipients than do employers that have experience hiring welfare recipients.
- While most employers are willing to hire welfare recipients, the entry level job market is problematic. Over 25 percent of entry-level jobs nationwide do not offer benefits; 40 percent of restaurant industry jobs do not. Of those companies that offer benefits, most require workers to have been on the job for several months. This is a problem, given high turnover in entry level positions.

Employer Practices	Employee Characteristics	Labor Market Functioning	Government Policies
<input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industries	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Geography	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compensation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand	<input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority	<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories	<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
Qualitative Methods	Qualitative Data	Quantitative Data: Survey	Quantitative Data: Records
<input type="checkbox"/> Case Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Employer	<input type="checkbox"/> CPS	<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Employee	<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP	<input type="checkbox"/> WIA
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Markets	<input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI	<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Four City	<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-74

Author Nannette Relave
Title Improving Collaboration Between Welfare and Workforce Development Agencies
Publication Date June 2002
Publication Organization Welfare Information Network

Abstract

This Issue Note by the Welfare Innovation Network describes a model of collaboration between welfare and workforce development agencies, and strategies and opportunities for further collaboration in the face of TANF and WIA reauthorization. The paper is a brief literature review of the policy and program issues; research findings; and best/innovative practices in welfare and workforce development collaboration. This Issue Note describes models of collaboration between welfare and workforce development agencies, presents strategies to facilitate collaboration, and considers opportunities to address collaboration in the reauthorization of WIA and TANF.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-75

Authors Brian Riedl and Robert Rector
Title Myths and Facts: Why Successful Welfare Reform Must Strengthen Work Requirements
Publication Date July 2002
Publication Organization The Heritage Foundation

Abstract

This piece argues that work-based programs have been extremely successful and asserts that greater percentages of welfare recipients should not be exempted from these requirements.

Key points:

- Individuals placed in work-first (and not education or training-first) programs earn more than individuals placed in education or training-first programs.
- Businesses show an interest in hiring welfare recipients.
- Government income supplements make it possible for individuals who leave welfare but earn low wages to have incomes that are above the \$13,874 poverty income threshold (for a family of three).

The authors also argue that individuals who are hard to serve will benefit from work-first programs.

Employer Practices <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-76

Authors Brandon Roberts and Jeffrey Padden
Title Who Hires Welfare Recipients?
Publication Date August 1998a
Publication Organization The Mott Foundation/ Brandon Roberts and Associates

Abstract

Methodology:

In four states—Florida, Maryland, Oregon and Missouri—JOBS data for the last two quarters of 1995 were matched with UI data for the first two quarters of 1996. (This allowed for a certain amount of lag time for individuals to transition to work.) All individuals in the JOBS database are individuals who have received welfare. JOBS and UI data were merged into "the first multistate database that matches a group of welfare recipients with their employers by firm size and type."

Key findings:

- More welfare recipients found jobs in firms with more than 100 employees than in smaller firms. (This is contrary to employment patterns for the U.S. as a whole.) Overall, 61 percent of welfare recipients were employed by businesses with 100+ employees.
- That said, very small firms (fewer than 20 employees) employed one welfare recipient for every seven other workers, while very large firms maintained ratios closer to one welfare recipient for every 187 employees.
- The pool of businesses that employed welfare recipients consisted of a substantial number of very large businesses that employed large numbers of recipients, and many smaller businesses that employed only a few welfare recipients.
- Recipient hires were clustered in a small number of sectors, including service and retail. Business services, eating and drinking places and health services employed the largest proportion of welfare recipients.
- Manufacturing businesses employed welfare recipients at a lower relative rate compared to other firms.
- Welfare recipient quarterly income was, on average, 92 percent of the income of a worker who worked full time and earned minimum wage over a three month period.
- Only 37 percent of welfare recipients received earnings over minimum wage.
- Welfare recipients in industries that employed large numbers of recipients received substantially lower earnings than did those who were employed in industries that employed fewer recipients.
- Welfare recipients in companies with fewer than 100 employees received competitively higher earning than did those employed by larger businesses.
- Welfare recipients of color were less likely to be employed by smaller firms or in the manufacturing and construction sectors.
- Larger firms and businesses in the services and transportation/utility sectors were more likely to employ welfare recipients of color.
- Welfare recipients in Missouri and Oregon received higher quarterly earnings on average than did those in Florida and Maryland.

<p>Employer Practices</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Employee Characteristics</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Labor Market Functioning</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industries <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Government Policies</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
<p>Qualitative Methods</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Qualitative Data</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<p>Quantitative Data: Survey</p> <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Quantitative Data: Records</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-77

Authors Brandon Roberts and Jeffrey Padden
Title Ten Strategies for Connecting Welfare Recipients with Employers
Publication Date August 1998b
Publication Organization The Mott Foundation/ Brandon Roberts and Associates

Abstract

This article provides an overview of ten employer-focused strategies for "making welfare to work work" by connecting welfare recipients with employers. Strategies highlighted include engaging the private sector through:

- Industry associations
- Individual employers
- Temporary staffing agencies
- Local business associations/chambers of commerce
- Fee for service firms
- Community based organizations
- Educational and vocational training institutions
- Employer subsidies
- Public/private Partnerships
- State and local welfare systems.

A key point throughout is focusing on the private sector as a key partner and customer of welfare to work services.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-78

Authors Brandon Roberts and Jeffrey Padden
Title Employers' Perspectives on Welfare-to-Work: Focus Group Findings
Publication Date August 1998c
Publication Organization The Mott Foundation/ Brandon Roberts and Associates

Abstract

Methodology:

Three sets of employer focus groups were held in summer and fall of 1997. Focus groups were held in Baltimore, MD; Detroit, MI; and Orlando, FL. Individual sessions were designed to be focused around specific industry sectors or other common employer themes. In total, the focus groups included representatives of over 50 businesses.

Key findings include:

- There is employer demand for welfare to work (WtW) workers, however many employers are concerned that these workers will not produce high quality work. Some feel that individuals transitioning from welfare to work lack appropriate familiarity with standard workplace culture and norms.
- Employers believe that individuals on welfare face significant barriers that limit their ability to work effectively. (They were particularly aware of potential workers' transportation and childcare issues.)
- Many employers have had negative experiences with the publicly supported employment system and were not confident in the public sectors' ability to meet their needs. They felt that companies needed to have greater opportunities to influence WtW policy.
- Many employers have little knowledge of welfare to work policies and supports that are available to them for subsidizing the hiring of individuals on welfare. Most employers agreed they were more interested in finding quality hires than in receiving tax incentives for hiring.
- Businesses must, first and foremost, pay attention to their bottom line profits and productivity.
- Firms were very concerned about the frequency and cost of turnover.
- Most firms have few resources for helping workers with challenging personal situations (and do not see doing this as their role). They are, however, willing to provide relevant on-the-job training.

<p>Employer Practices</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Employee Characteristics</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Labor Market Functioning</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industries <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Government Policies</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
<p>Qualitative Methods</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Qualitative Data</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<p>Quantitative Data: Survey</p> <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Quantitative Data: Records</p> <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-79

Authors Steve Savner and Abbey Frank
Title Comments Regarding WIA Reauthorization and Linkages with the TANF Program
Publication Date June 2002
Publication Organization Center for Law and Social Policy

Abstract

Since Fall 2001, the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) has been engaged in a research project focused on the experiences of four states that have gone the furthest in combining their TANF and WIA programs: Florida, Ohio, Utah, and Wisconsin. The project will culminate in a report to be released later in 2003. These comments focus on the coordination of TANF and WIA efforts at the state and local levels. This document refers to a current CLASP study of four states that have consolidated their administration of WIA and TANF activities. The report first comments on the relatively limited use of training by WIA customers, which it attributes to: (1) the system of sequential eligibility, whereby clients cannot immediately access all types of services, (2) the limited availability of training resources, and (3) the strong economy of the late 1990s. The document cites reports by community-based organizations in Washington, D.C.; Springfield, MA; and Minneapolis and Brooklyn Park, MN, which note difficulties of low-income persons in accessing basic and training services at their local One-Stop Centers.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| Employer Practices
<input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Compensation
<input type="checkbox"/> Training
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Employee Characteristics
<input type="checkbox"/> Skills
<input type="checkbox"/> Race
<input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Labor Market Functioning
<input type="checkbox"/> Industries
<input type="checkbox"/> Geography
<input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand
<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories
<input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Government Policies
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other |
| Qualitative Methods
<input type="checkbox"/> Case Study
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Qualitative Data
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer
<input type="checkbox"/> Employee
<input type="checkbox"/> Markets
<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies | Quantitative Data: Survey
<input type="checkbox"/> CPS
<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP
<input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI
<input type="checkbox"/> Four City
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Quantitative Data: Records
<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> WIA
<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other |

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-80

Author Jonathan Schlefer
Title Wildcat Service Corporation and the Private Industry Partnership
Publication Date 2000
Publication Organization Jobs for the Future

Abstract

This article profiles Wildcat Services Corporation's Private Industry Program (PIP).

Key points:

- PIP graduates about 80 percent of enrollees and about 80 percent of graduates are placed.
- Essential to PIP's success is its focus on jobs first. Only after Wildcat staff locate firms that have a demand for employees does training begin.
- Equally important is PIP's focus on dual customers. Employee clients are regarded as as important to the program as are participants.
- Despite companies' desire for participants to be trained and placed quickly, training should not be rushed.
- Organizations that focus on employees' needs and placement must cultivate a supportive program culture so that program participants learn work norms throughout their training. Accordingly, staff should model the kinds of behaviors that participants will need to adopt to succeed in the workplace (dress, punctuality, etc.)
- Wildcat is now applying the PIP model to train lower-skilled individuals for jobs that require fewer skills than those for which PIP graduates are trained.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-81

Primary Author John Sweeney
Secondary Author
Title High-Road Partnerships Report
Publication Date 2003
Publication Organization AFL-CIO Working for America Institute

Abstract

The Working for America Institutes asserts that, in the recently developed 'knowledge-based' economy, unions can be a successful intermediary that helps workers find reliable high-quality employment and provide employers with highly skilled and trained employees. The High Road Partnership Report describes the findings from the case studies of 14 partnerships. The purpose of the paper was to identify successful elements and barriers as well as technical assistance that could expand the reach of High-Road Partnerships. This study examined the structures and funding bases of these partnerships and then compiled a matrix for comparison. The paper reveals preliminary findings on the state and outcomes of these partnership programs.

Employer Practices <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-82

Author Martin Simon
Title A Comprehensive Look At State-Funded, Employer-Focused Job Training Programs
Publication Date 1999
Publication Organization National Governors Association/Regional Technology Strategies, Inc.

Abstract

Methodology:

This report is based upon a May 1998 survey of agencies in forty -seven states that operated state-funded, employer-focused job training programs, case studies of programs in eight states, and profiles of sixty programs operated by the forty -seven states.

Key observations:

- For most states, employer-focused job training programs are viewed as a tool for encouraging job retention and growth among existing firms. Most states also aim to recruit new businesses, but consider this a secondary goal.
- States estimate that the largest share of training expenditures is used for the development of 'generic vocational and technical skills' that are likely transferable to other employments.
- Many states are exploring new funding strategies for financing employer-focused training programs.
- Most states direct their funding to large firms. The survey estimated that about 70% of total funding for these types of programs went to manufacturing firms.
- States varied a great deal in what they spent on training projects.
- States are moving towards funding greater numbers of multifirm training projects (as opposed to training projects focused on a single firm). These projects encourage networking and joint action among firms to pool common training activities, and may result in economies of scale.
- Although almost all states report that employers believe basic skill deficiencies among their workers are a significant problem, there generally are weak links between state-funded employer-focused training programs and traditional federally funded job training and adult education programs. In many cases, employers consider federal programs too narrowly focused, too difficult to access, and not linked to the actual occupational skills they need in the workplace.

The authors conclude that there is a need for more in-depth evaluation studies on the impact of employer-focused training programs.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-83

Author U.S. Chamber of Commerce
Title A Chamber Survey: Spotlight on Workforce Development
Publication Date November 2001
Publication Organization U.S. Chamber of Commerce

Abstract

This document discusses the methods used by various Chambers of Commerce throughout the country to increase workforce participation. Best practices include convening and supporting employers; improving education, training, and support services; helping govern or improve the workforce development system; conducting research and development; and brokering and/or providing services.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- Best Practices
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-84

Author U.S. Department of Labor
Title Welfare to Work Lessons Learned for TANF and WIA Reauthorization
Publication Date Fall 2001
Publication Organization U.S. Department of Labor

Abstract

The U.S. Department of Labor's Division of Welfare-to-Work (WtW), which is part of the Employment and Training Administration, requested research papers on "lessons learned" from TANF and WIA operational experience. This report synthesizes the ideas of the 28 papers that were received, in an attempt to cull best practices on how the TANF and WIA reauthorization processes can ensure a more effective working relationship between the TANF and WIA systems. A range of public, private, and nonprofit institutions submitted papers. Seven issue areas dominated the responses: program design; partnerships; employers; retention and advancement; barriers; funding; and program requirements.

Key findings:

- Staff should be trained to deal with these challenges.
- TANF funding should be reauthorized at least at the current level, with targeted funding for clients with barriers.
- TANF program requirements should increase the 12-month limit on training as a work activity, and provide more general flexibility with time limits.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-85

Author	U.S. General Accounting Office
Title	Workforce Investment Act: Improvements Needed in Performance Measures to Provide a More Accurate Picture of WIA's Effectiveness
Publication Date	February 2002b
Publication Organization	U.S. General Accounting Office

Abstract

This study was designed to assess the effectiveness of WIA performance measures and their ability to provide useful information on the achievement of One-Stop Center goals and targets. The study explores: (1) issues faced and progress made by states and localities in implementing performance measures for WIA-funded programs, (2) the usefulness of these measures in accurately determining program performance, and (3) the extent to which performance of One-Stop Centers is being accurately measured. This review of performance measurement is based on a survey of state WIA program administrators in all 50 states. Five states (Florida, Indiana, Missouri, Oregon, and Pennsylvania) were selected for more intensive study and received site visits, during which interviews were conducted with state and local workforce investment officials, Department of Labor officials, and national associations representing state and local workforce development officials. The research also involved a review of relevant documents.

Key findings:

- New, updated automated data systems are needed to collect and report WIA data.
- Performance levels may be set too high, and they do not take into account local labor market and other economic conditions.
- Performance measures are likely to influence procedures and decisions, including which clients to serve.
- Measures are complex and time-consuming to implement, because of some lack of clarity about which clients using which services should be included, when data should be collected, and how measures should be calculated.
- The requirement that UI wage records be used for some outcome data has created a need for new procedures to access this information.
- Performance measurement data are not comparable across states and localities; therefore, they may not accurately portray performance of WIA programs.

<p>Employer Practices</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Employee Characteristics</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Labor Market Functioning</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Government Policies</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
<p>Qualitative Methods</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Qualitative Data</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	<p>Quantitative Data: Survey</p> <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	<p>Quantitative Data: Records</p> <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-86

Author U.S. General Accounting Office
Title Welfare Reform: States' Experiences in Providing Employment Assistance to TANF Clients
Publication Date February 1999c
Publication Organization U.S. General Accounting Office

Abstract

This study describes the availability and implementation of employment and training services for TANF clients, including the structure, organization, and funding for these services. GAO gathered extensive information on the TANF and workforce development systems for this report. Agency staff contacted federal and regional officials in the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Labor in all 50 states. Additional sources of information included the National Governors' Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Association of Counties, the Rockefeller Institute, the Urban Institute, and the American Public Human Services Association.

Key findings:

- By November 1998, GAO found that four of the five states continued to maintain separate program structures, although many localities had developed procedures to bring the two systems closer together to provide more employment and training assistance to TANF recipients.
- The primary goal of workforce activities in all five states was rapid job placement, and training focused on job readiness, often through community service placements and unpaid work experience.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-87

Author U.S. General Accounting Office
Title Welfare Reform: States Are Using TANF Flexibility to Adapt Work Requirements and Time Limits to Meet State and Local Needs
Publication Date March 2002d
Publication Organization U.S. General Accounting Office

Abstract

This testimony concerns the extent to which families receiving cash assistance are excluded from work requirements and time limits, and it was given as Congress considered reauthorization of TANF. Four key issues are addressed: (1) the extent of child-only cases among the cash assistance caseload funded by federal TANF and state MOE (maintenance-of-effort funds); (2) how states made use of work requirement flexibility; (3) the number of families states have excluded from time limits; and (4) key issues related to states' experiences in applying TANF work requirements and time limits. This study employed site visits in four states, telephone interviews with TANF officials in eight other states, and a survey administered to TANF officials in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. This report focuses on time limits and work requirements related to the TANF program. WIA One-Stop Centers are not specifically mentioned in the report.

Key findings:

- Of the 2.1 million cash assistance cases funded by federal TANF or state MOE funds in the fall of 2001, one-third of these cases were composed of one or more children only (no adult in these families receives TANF or state MOE, so work requirements and time limits do not apply).
- Because welfare caseloads have declined substantially since 1996, states' mandated participation rates have also greatly reduced. As a result, states have increased flexibility in determining the numbers of adults that must be involved in work activities.
- After excluding child-only cases, states excluded from time limits 11 percent of the remaining 1.4 million families headed by adults.
- Key issues include the relatively limited number of families that have reached their time limits so far and the future adequacy of the federal 20 percent extension.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WIA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-88

Author U.S. General Accounting Office
Title Workforce Investment Act: States and Localities Increasingly Coordinate Services for TANF Clients, but Better Information Needed on Effective Practices
Publication Date July 2002a
Publication Organization U.S. General Accounting Office

Abstract

This study examined the extent to which states and localities are coordinating TANF and WIA services for TANF clients, and how this has changed since 2000; what is known about the conditions that influence the coordination of TANF services in One-Stop Centers; and the barriers that impede state and local coordination efforts. The report and testimony is based on an analysis of surveys of WIA agency officials in all 50 states, which was conducted in late 2001 and early 2002. The researchers also visited nine localities in four states (Arizona, Connecticut, Louisiana, and New Jersey) in late 2001. The study concludes that most states are coordinating TANF and WIA to some degree and that the level of coordination increased from 2000 (the full implementation of WIA) to 2001. Using results from the survey of workforce development agency officials, the report notes the ways in which states and localities have coordinated and integrated services. The study does not, however, measure the proportion of TANF or other low-income clients served through One-Stops or whether the proportion of TANF clients served affects One-Stop administrative operations or service delivery strategies. Although it provides examples of innovative service delivery methods that some One-Stops have implemented to serve TANF clients, the study does not investigate whether or not these methods are in some way related to the number of TANF/low-income clients served or placed.

Key findings:

- A need to facilitate services to employers
- A need to increase utilization of One-Stops by jobseekers
- A need to create a customer-friendly environment for jobseekers
- A need to streamline intake and assessment procedures
- A need to provide post-employment services that focus on retention and advancement
- There is no clear way for states and localities to access information on successful approaches to overcoming obstacles in service coordination.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-89

Author Urban Institute
Title Low -Income and Low -Skilled Workers' Involvement in Nonstandard Employment
Publication Date October 2002
Publication Organization Urban Institute

Abstract

This study looks at the role of alternative work arrangements in today's labor market, focusing on three questions:

1. How do alternative work arrangements differ from other arrangements in the characteristics of workers holding the jobs and in the characteristics of the jobs?
2. How have these characteristics changed over time?
3. How do outcomes for low -income and at-risk individuals who have worked in alternative work arrangements compare with those of similar workers—both those at-risk and not at-risk—who have worked in traditional employment and with those of nonemployed persons?

Some key findings:

- Educational levels are low, with about one-third of workers in alternative arrangements lacking a high school diploma.
- The number of industries drawing on temporary help workers has increased. The median education level of temporary workers employed in these industries is quite high.
- At-risk workers in temporary work are less likely to have employer-provided benefits than are at-risk regular workers.
- Workers at risk of welfare-receipt fare worse in alternative work arrangements than do other workers in alternative arrangements.
- At-risk workers also are less happy with their work and more likely to be in the job out of necessity than other temporary workers.
- There is little or no relationship between the industries and occupations that mostly hire low -wage workers and those that mostly hire temporary workers.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Best Practices
- Employment Outcomes
- Economic Context

Document TE-90

Authors Carl Van Horn and William A. Tracy
Title One-Stop Innovations: Leading Change Under the WIA One-Stop System
Publication Date March 2002
Publication Organization John J. Heldrich Center for Workforce Development, The State University of New Jersey -Rutgers

Abstract

The goal of this interim report is to identify, document, and disseminate information on innovative and promising practices supporting One-Stop Centers. The study team visited 25 sites across the country, first soliciting nominations from a variety of workforce development system organizations. Selection criteria included promising practices in services to job seekers; services to employers; and One-Stop design and management. Other characteristics used in sampling were urban/rural/suburban differences, and national geography. Two researchers conducted one- to two-day site visits to selected One-Stop Centers. Using data from site visits, the study found promising practices in the following areas: integrating programs and services; universal access; empowering individuals; sectoral strategies for employers and job seekers; using information technology to improve service quality; and One-Stop effectiveness measures. Findings from the study are organized across these themes. The study found that colocation and service integration, achieved by a variety of sites, results in reduced duplication of services, higher quality services, better access, and increased customer and staff satisfaction.

Employer Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Employee Characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Labor Market Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Industries <input type="checkbox"/> Geography <input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Government Policies <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Qualitative Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Qualitative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Employer <input type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Markets <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies	Quantitative Data: Survey <input type="checkbox"/> CPS <input type="checkbox"/> SIPP <input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI <input type="checkbox"/> Four City <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Quantitative Data: Records <input type="checkbox"/> UI <input type="checkbox"/> WA <input type="checkbox"/> LEHD <input type="checkbox"/> BLS <input type="checkbox"/> Other

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-91

Authors Melissa Wavelet and Jacquie Anderson
Title Promoting Self-Sufficiency: What We Know About Sustaining Employment and Increasing Income Among Welfare Recipients and the Working Poor
Publication Date 2002
Publication Organization Focus, vol. 22, no. 1

Abstract

This article synthesizes current research regarding factors and strategies that help welfare recipients sustain employment and increase income. It summarizes a variety of qualitative and quantitative reports (some of which are included in this database.)

Key points:

- Transitioning from welfare to work is difficult, and it has become more difficult since the passage of PRWORA and establishment of TANF block grants. Jobs for leavers are worse now than they used to be (they pay less, offer fewer benefits, etc.) and most individuals who make the transition do not work consistently. Many (about 23-35 percent) end up returning to welfare within one year. (See the article for citations regarding this.)
- Low wages themselves pose a barrier to retention, as low-wage jobs make it difficult for individuals to pay for necessities (housing, childcare, etc.) and thus render potential employees unable to attend work consistently.
- Obtaining work, sustaining employment and moving up to a better job may be separate challenges, and factors that render individuals successful at one of those things may not necessarily help them to achieve success at all three.
- Obtaining an Associates' Degree, however, may be a particularly effective way for individuals to earn more for sustained periods of time.

Effective strategies for help?

- Pre-employment services can promote steady employment (though there is not sufficient evidence to determine which pre-employment services are most effective).
- Financial incentives and earnings supplements can both induce individuals to take jobs and help them to sustain employment.
- Post employment job retention services (though these are still being studied and there is a paucity of good, statistical evidence on these kinds of programs).
- Although these strategies can be effective, there are several challenges in implementing post-employment job retention services: It is difficult to engage employed people in post-placement activities and services. Not all programs get to the heart of the issues that cause participant job loss. Workers often do not avail themselves of the full array of work supports (e.g. Medicaid/CHIP, childcare supports, etc.)
- Effective post-employment job retention services should be targeted to meet the specific needs of the population served.
- Another promising practice for post-employment services is for providers to develop relationships with key partners (CBOs, workforce boards, community colleges, etc.)
- Industry-based efforts also suggest promising results. SEDLP (an Aspen Institute demonstration project) suggests that sectoral strategies can yield impressive benefits in employment retention and wage progression.

Employer Practices

- Recruitment and Hiring
- Performance Assessment
- Compensation
- Training
- Other

Employee Characteristics

- Skills
- Race
- Child care/Transportation
- Experience/Seniority
- Other

Labor Market Functioning

- Industries
- Geography
- Supply/Demand
- Job Categories
- Market Intermediaries
- Other

Government Policies

- Employer Mandates
- Employer Incentives
- Employee Placement
- Anti-Discrimination
- Other

Qualitative Methods

- Case Study
- Promising Practices Assessment
- Qualitative Evaluation
- Implementation Study
- Other

Qualitative Data

- Employer
- Employee
- Markets
- Government Agencies

Quantitative Data: Survey

- CPS
- SIPP
- MCSUI
- Four City
- Other

Quantitative Data: Records

- UI
- WIA
- LEHD
- BLS
- Other

What does this document address?

- Employer Perspective
- Best Practices
- Economic Context
- TANF Recipient Perspective
- Employment Outcomes

Document TE-92

Primary Author Working for America Institute
Secondary Author
Title Helping Low-Wage Workers Succeed Through Innovative Union Partnerships
Publication Date April, 2002
Publication Organization AFL-CIO Working for America Institute

Abstract

This article outlines the role that unions can play in the assisting low-wage workers to find, keep and advance in employment opportunities. Knowledge is drawn from four case studies that took place in Philadelphia, Las Vegas, Milwaukee, and Seattle. The article recognizes the fundamental economic changes brought about by the 'New Economy' and uses information gathered through these case studies to outline a strategy for unions to continue being effective conduits for workers needs and advancements within that construct. This strategy is referred to as "high Road Partnerships". These "High Road Partnerships" are "Union-led multi-employer partnerships in which unions and employers work together to shape local economies that provide workers with good jobs based on skill". They bring together employers, unions and organizations in order to better shape the local economy. The aim of these partnerships from the union's perspective is to become a vital link in assisting low-income workers in a skill-based economy..

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Employer Practices
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Compensation
<input type="checkbox"/> Training
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Employee Characteristics
<input type="checkbox"/> Skills
<input type="checkbox"/> Race
<input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Labor Market Functioning
<input type="checkbox"/> Industries
<input type="checkbox"/> Geography
<input type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand
<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories
<input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Government Policies
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| Qualitative Methods
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Study
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Qualitative Data
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer
<input type="checkbox"/> Employee
<input type="checkbox"/> Markets
<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies | Quantitative Data: Survey
<input type="checkbox"/> CPS
<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP
<input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI
<input type="checkbox"/> Four City
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Quantitative Data: Records
<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> WIA
<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other |

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Document TE-93

Author Lily Zandniapour and Maureen Conway
Title Closing the Gap: How Sectoral Workforce Development Programs Benefit the Working Poor
Publication Date July 2001
Publication Organization The Aspen Institute

Abstract

A primary goal of the Sectoral Employment Development Learning Project (SEDL P) is to address the question of whether sectoral approaches work. The short answer is yes (avoid colloquialism). Participant outcomes show trainees made significant strides in the labor market, reporting higher annual earnings and earnings per hour; higher employment rates; increased hours of work; and improved job satisfaction and job quality in a span of only one year after completing the training program.

Respondents' training completion rates were very high, as was the percentage of respondents who reported using their training on the job: 87 percent reported they completed their training, and 82 percent said they used the skills or knowledge learned in the program on the job. One year after training, 60 percent of all respondents reported that the training they received in the program helped them get a new job.

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Employer Practices
<input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compensation
<input type="checkbox"/> Training
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Employee Characteristics
<input type="checkbox"/> Skills
<input type="checkbox"/> Race
<input type="checkbox"/> Child care/Transportation
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience/Seniority
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Labor Market Functioning
<input type="checkbox"/> Industries
<input type="checkbox"/> Geography
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supply/Demand
<input type="checkbox"/> Job Categories
<input type="checkbox"/> Market Intermediaries
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Government Policies
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Mandates
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer Incentives
<input type="checkbox"/> Employee Placement
<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination
<input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| Qualitative Methods
<input type="checkbox"/> Case Study
<input type="checkbox"/> Promising Practices Assessment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualitative Evaluation
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Study
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Qualitative Data
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee
<input type="checkbox"/> Markets
<input type="checkbox"/> Government Agencies | Quantitative Data: Survey
<input type="checkbox"/> CPS
<input type="checkbox"/> SIPP
<input type="checkbox"/> MCSUI
<input type="checkbox"/> Four City
<input type="checkbox"/> Other | Quantitative Data: Records
<input type="checkbox"/> UI
<input type="checkbox"/> WIA
<input type="checkbox"/> LEHD
<input type="checkbox"/> BLS
<input type="checkbox"/> Other |

What does this document address?

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Perspective | <input type="checkbox"/> Best Practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Context |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TANF Recipient Perspective | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employment Outcomes | |

Bibliography

- Abt Associates (1999). *Welfare to Work: Reaching a New Workforce. A Guide to Welfare to Work Resources for Atlanta*. Bethesda, MD: Abt Associates.
- Abt Associates (1999). *Welfare to Work: Reaching a New Workforce. A Guide to Welfare to Work Resources for New Orleans*. Bethesda, MD: Abt Associates.
- Abt Associates (1999). *Private Interests, Shared Concerns: The Relationship Between Employers and the AECF Jobs Initiative*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
- AFYA Inc. (1998). *Post-Employment Services: Making Job Retention and Post-Employment Services Work. Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network Workshop Summary*. Washington, DC: Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Ahlstrand, Amanda, and Max Armbruster (2001). *Workplace Education Investments and Strategies for Low-Wage Workers: Patterns and Practices in Employer-Provided Education*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Andersson, Fredrik, Harry Holzer, and Julia Lane (2002). *The Interactions of Workers and Firms in the Low-Wage Labor Market*. Washington, DC: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
- Association of Joint Labor-Management Educational Programs (2002). *Success by Design: What Works in Workforce Development*. Ottawa, ON: The Conference Board of Canada.
- Autor, David, and Susan Houseman (2002). "The Role of Temporary Employment Agencies in Welfare to Work: Part of the Problem or Part of the Solution?" *Focus*, vol. 22, no. 1 (Special Issue), pp. 63-70.
- Bartik, Timothy (2001a). *Fighting Poverty with Labor Demand Policies*. Kalamazoo, MI: W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Bartik, Timothy (2001b). *Jobs for the Poor: Can Labor Demand Policies Help?* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bellis, David D., and Susan J. Lawless (2001). *Workforce Development Consortia Provide Needed Services*. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office.
- Bliss, Stephen (2000). *San Francisco Works: Toward an Employer-Led Approach to Welfare Reform and Workforce Development*. New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

- Bloom, Dan, and Charles Michalopoulos (2001). *How Welfare and Work Policies Affect Employment and Income: A Synthesis of Research*. New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.
- Bosworth, Brian (2002). *Working Together on Worker Training*. Part of a Series of Reports on Engaging Employers in Workforce Development. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future.
- Boushey, Heather (2002). *Staying Employed After Welfare: Work Supports and Job Quality Vital to Employment Tenure and Wage Growth*. Economic Policy Institute Briefing Paper. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- Brown, Amy, Maria L. Buck, and Erik Skinner (1998). *Business Partnerships: How to Involve Employers in Welfare Reform*. New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.
- Buck, Maria L. (2002). *Charting New Territory: Early Implementation of the Workforce Investment Act*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Center for Workforce Preparation (2003). *Rising to the Challenge: Business Voices on the Public Workforce Development System*. Washington, DC: U.S. Chamber of Commerce.
- Clark, Peggy, and Steven Dawson (1995). *Jobs and the Urban Poor: Privately Initiated Sectoral Strategies*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.
- Clymer, Carol, Brandon Roberts and Julie Strawn (2001). *States of Change: Policies and Programs to Promote Low-Wage Workers' Steady Employment and Advancement*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Conway, Maureen, and Lily Zandniapour (2002). *Industry-Based Employment Programs: Implications for Welfare Reauthorization and Key Survey Findings*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.
- Danziger, Sandra, and Kristin S. Seefeldt (2002). "Barriers to Employment and the "Hard to Serve: Implications for Services, Sanctions, and Time Limits." *Focus*, vol. 22, no. 1 (Special Issue), pp. 76-81.
- Danziger, Sandra, Mary Corcoran, Sheldon Danziger, Colleen Heflin, Ariel Kalil, Judith Levine, Daniel Rosen, Kristin Seefeldt, Kristine Siefert and Richard Tolman. (1999). *Barriers to the Employment of Welfare Recipients*. Ann Arbor, MI: Poverty Research and Training Center, University of Michigan.
- Dickinson, Lisa, Lisa Hick, Marc S. Miller, Jack Mills, and Hilary Pennington (2001). *Win-Win Corporate Community Partnerships for Workforce Development*. Issue Brief. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future.

- Dillman, Don A. (2000). *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Eberts, Randall (2002). *Design, Implementation and Evaluation of the Work-First Profiling Project*. Kalamazoo, MI: W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Elliott, Mark, Anne Roder, Elisabeth King, and Joseph Stillman (2001). *Gearing Up: An Interim Report on the Sectoral Employment Initiative*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Elliott, Mark, and Elisabeth King (1999). *Labor Market Leverage: Sectoral Employment Field Report*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Fischer, David, Julian Alssid, and Neil Kleiman (2002). *Rebuilding Job Training from the Ground Up: Workforce System Reform after 9/11*. New York, NY: Center for an Urban Future.
- Foster-Bey, John, and Lynette Rawlings (2002). *Can Targeting Industries Improve Earnings for Welfare Recipients Moving from Welfare-to-Work? Preliminary Findings*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Freedman, Stephen, Daniel Friedlander, Gayle Hamilton, JoAnn Rock, Mirisa Mitchell, Jodi Nudelman, Amanda Schweder, and Laura Storto (2000). *National Evaluation of Welfare to Work Strategies: Evaluating Alternative Welfare-to-Work Approaches: Two-Year Impacts for Eleven Programs*. New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.
- Giloth, Robert (2000). "Learning from the Field: Economic Growth and Workforce Development in the 1990s." *Economic Development Quarterly* (Summer 2000).
- Gladden Tricia, and Christopher Taber (2000). "Wage Progression among Less Skilled Workers." In *Finding Jobs: Work and Welfare Reform*, edited by Rebecca Blank and David Card. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Gordon, Anne, and Susanne James-Burdumy (2002). *Impacts of the Virginia Initiative for Employment Not Welfare*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.
- Gruber, David (2002). *We're Education, You're Semiconductors: Improving Worker Skills Through Employer-Community College Partnerships*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Hangley, Bill, Jr., and Anais Loizilon (2002). *The Transitional Work Corporation: Philadelphia @ Work, an Innovative Welfare-to-Work Strategy for Participants with Substantial Job-Readiness Barriers*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.

- Harrison, Benett, Marcus Weiss and Jon Gant (1995). *Building Bridges: Community Development Corporations and the World of Employment and Training*. New York, NY: Ford Foundation.
- Hebert, Scott (2002). *AECF Jobs Initiative: Evaluation of the Capacity Building Phase, 1997-2000*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
- Holzer, Harry (1996). *What Employers Want: Job Prospects for Less Educated Workers*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Holzer, Harry (1999). "Will Employers Hire Welfare Recipients? Recent Survey Evidence from Michigan." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, vol. 18, no. 3.
- Holzer, Harry (2002a). "Employers and Welfare Recipients: What Their Interactions Imply for Public Policy." *Focus*, vol. 22, no. 1 (Special Issue), pp. 71-75.
- Holzer, Harry (2002b). "Mismatch in the Low-Wage Labor Market: Job-Hiring Perspective" In *The Low-Wage Labor Market: Challenges and Opportunities for Economic Self Sufficiency*, edited by Kelleen Kaye and Demetra Nightingale. Washington, DC: Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Holzer, Harry and Steven Raphael (2003). *Employers in the Boom: How Did the Hiring of Unskilled Workers Change during the 1990s?* Discussion Paper #1267-03. Madison, WI: Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin.
- Holzer, Harry, and Michael Stoll (2000). *Employer Demand for Welfare Recipients by Race*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Holzer, Harry and Michael Stoll (2001a). *Meeting the Demand: Hiring Patterns of Welfare Recipients in Four Metropolitan Areas*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Holzer, Harry and Michael Stoll (2001b). *Job Performance and Retention Among Welfare Recipients*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Hotz, V. Joseph, Charles H. Mullin and John Karl Scholz (2002). "Welfare Reform, Employment, and Advancement." *Focus*, vol. 22, no. 1 (Special Issue), pp. 51-55.
- Isbell, Kellie, John W. Trutko, Burt S. Barnow, Demetra S. Nightengale, and Nancy Pindus (1996a). *Involving Employers in Training: Literature Review*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.
- Isbell, Kellie, John W. Trutko, Burt S. Barnow, Demetra S. Nightengale, and Nancy Pindus (1996b). *Involving Employers in Training: Case Studies*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.

- Jobs for the Future (1998). *Employer Intermediaries: A Briefing Paper*. New York, NY: Ford Foundation.
- Jobs for the Future (2001). *Everybody WINS: Effectively Involving Business in Workforce Development*. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future.
- Kaye, Kelleen, and Demetra S. Nightingale (2000). *The Low-Wage Labor Market: Challenges and Opportunities for Economic Sufficiency*. Washington, DC: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Kazis, Richard, and Hilary Kopp (1997). *Both Sides Now: New Directions in Promoting Work and Learning for Disadvantaged Youth*. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future.
- Kirby, Gretchen, Thomas Fraker, LaDonna Pavetti, and Martha Kovak (2003). *Families on TANF in Illinois: Employment Assets and Liabilities*. Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research.
- Kogan, Deborah, and Katherine P. Dickinson (1997). *Creating Workforce Development Systems that Work: An Evaluation of the Initial One-Stop Implementation Experience*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.
- Kogan, Deborah, and Kristin Wolff (1999). *Framework for Collaboration: Partnering to Improve Welfare to Work Outcomes*. Menlo Park, CA: SPR Associates.
- Kwas, Peter, and Beth Siegel (1995). *Jobs and the Urban Poor: Publicly Initiated Sectoral Strategies*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.
- Lane, Julia, and David Stevens (1997). *Welfare-to-Work Policy: Employer Hiring and Retention of Former Welfare Recipients*. Annapolis, MD: Maryland Governor's Workforce Investment Board.
- Lane, Julia, Kelly S. Mikelson, Patrick T. Sharkey, and Douglas A. Wissoker (2001). *Low-Income and Low-Skilled Workers' Involvement in Nonstandard Employment*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Lane, Julia, Kelly S. Mikelson, Patrick T. Sharkey, and Douglas A. Wissoker (2002). *Pathways to Work for Low-Income Workers: The Effect of Work in the Temporary Help Industry*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- La Prad, Jeannine, and Sharon Sand (1999). *Integration of Welfare and Workforce Development Systems in the Midwest: Analysis of Implementation*. Corporation for a Skilled Workforce.
- Long, David A., Heather Doyle, and Jean M. Amendolia (1999). *The Next Step: Jobs Initiative —Cost-Effectiveness Analysis*. Bethesda, MD: Abt Associates.

- Lynch, Lisa (2001). *Developing Intermediaries and the Training of Low-Wage Workers*. New York, NY: National Bureau for Economic Research.
- Martinson, Karin (1999). *Literature Review on Service Coordination and Integration in the Welfare and Workforce Development Systems*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- McGahey, Richard (2003). "Workforce Intermediaries: Recent Experience and Implications for Workforce Development." In *Workforce Intermediaries in the 21st Century*, edited by Robert Giloth. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- McGahey, Richard, and Catherine Dun Rappaport (2003). *Evaluation of Phase III of the Workforce Innovations Networks Demonstration: Interim Report*. Bethesda, MD: Abt Associates.
- McGahey, Richard, and Kendra Lodewick (2003). *Interim Report on the TechReach Project*. Bethesda, MD: Abt Associates.
- McIntire, James, and Amy L. Robins (1999). *Fixing to Change: A Best Practices Assessment of One-Stop Job Centers Working with Welfare Recipients*. Seattle, WA: Fiscal Policy Center, University of Washington.
- Mills, Jack, and Richard Kazis (1999). *Business Participation in Welfare-to-Work: Lessons from the United States*. Prepared for the Business Forum on Welfare-to-Work: Lessons from America, January 1999, London, U.K.
- Mills, Jack, and Heath Prince (2003). *Employer-Led Organizations and Career Ladders: Linking Worker Advancement with the Skill Needs of Employers*. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future.
- Moss, Philip, and Chris Tilly (1995). *Raised Hurdles for Black Men: Evidence from Interviews with Employers*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Moss, Philip, and Chris Tilly (2001). *Stories Employers Tell: Race, Skill, and Hiring in America*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Nightingale, Demetra, and Russell Jones (1997). *The Structural Link between JTPA and State Welfare Programs in 1997*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- O'Shea, Daniel, and Christopher T. King (2001). *The Workforce Investment Act of 1998: Restructuring Workforce Development Initiatives in States and Localities*. Albany, NY: Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government.
- Osterman, Paul (2001). "Employers in the Low-Wage/Low-Skill Labor Market." In *Low Wage Workers in the New Economy*, edited by Richard Kazis and Marc Miller. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

- Osterman, Paul, and Brenda A. Lautsch (1996). *Project QUEST: A Report to the Ford Foundation*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Sloan School of Management.
- Owen, Greg, and Amy Bush Stevens (2000). "Whose Job is It? Employers' Views on Welfare Reform." Paper presented at the Rural Dimensions of Welfare Reform Conference, Joint Center for Poverty Research, Northwestern University/University of Chicago.
- Paulsell, Diane, and Ali Stieglitz (2001). *Employment Retention and Advancement: Pennsylvania's Experience with Performance Goals*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.
- Pavetti, LaDonna, and Michelle Derr (2001). "Changing the Culture of the Welfare Office: The Role of Intermediaries in Linking TANF recipients with Jobs." *Economic Policy Review* (September 2001).
- Pavetti, LaDonna, Michelle Derr, Jacquelyn Anderson, Carole Trippe, and Sidnee Pashal (2000). *The Role of Intermediaries in Linking TANF Recipients with Jobs*. Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research.
- Pavetti, LaDonna, and Debra Strong (2001). *Work-Based Strategies for Hard-to-Employ TANF Recipients: A Preliminary Assessment of Program Models and Dimensions*. Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research.
- Pindas, Nancy, and Robin Koralek (2000). *Coordination and Integration of Welfare and Workforce Development Systems*. Washington, DC: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Pope, Nan, and Julie Strawn (2003). *Whose Job Is It? Creating Opportunity for Advancement*. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.
- Proscio, Tony, and Mark Elliot (2000). *Getting In, Staying On, Moving Up: A Practitioner's Approach to Employment Retention*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/ Private Ventures.
- Rademacher, Ida (2002). *Working with Value: Industry-Specific Approaches to Workforce Development—A Synthesis of Findings*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.
- Rademacher, Ida, Marshall Bear, and Maureen Conway (2001). *Project QUEST: A Case Study of a Sectoral Employment Development Approach*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.
- Ragan, Mark, and Richard Nathan (2002). *Welfare Reform and the Development of Comprehensive Human Service Systems*. Albany, NY: Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government.

- Rangarajan, Anu (1998). *Keeping Welfare Recipients Employed: A Guide for States Designing Job Retention Services*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematic Policy Research.
- Rangarajan, Anu (2001). *Ten Lessons Learned from the Post-Employment Services Projects*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.
- Rangarajan, Anu (2002). *The Road to Sustained Employment: Lessons from a U.S. Job Retention Initiative*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.
- Regenstein, Marsha, and Jack Meyer (1998). *Job Prospects for Welfare Recipients: Employers Speak Out in New Federalism: Issues and Options for States*. New Federalism Series A, No. A-25. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Relave, Nannette (2002). *Improving Collaboration between Welfare and Workforce Development Agencies*. WIN Issue Notes, vol. 6, no. 4. Washington, DC: Welfare Information Network.
- Riedl, Brian and Robert Rector (2002). *Myths and Facts: Why Successful Welfare Reform Must Strengthen Work Requirements*. Washington, DC: Heritage Foundation.
- Roberts, Brandon and Jeffrey Padden (1998a). *Who Hires Welfare Recipients?* Mott Foundation.
- Roberts, Brandon and Jeffrey Padden (1998b). *Ten Strategies for Connecting Welfare Recipients with Employers*. Mott Foundation.
- Roberts, Brandon and Jeffrey Padden (1998c). *Employers' Perspectives on Welfare-to-Work: Focus Group Findings*. Mott Foundation.
- Salant, P. and Dillman, D. (1994). *How to conduct your own survey*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Savner, Steve, and Abbey Frank (2002). *Comments Regarding WIA Reauthorization and Linkages with the TANF Program*. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.
- Schlefer, Jonathan (2000). *Wildcat Service Corporation and the Private Industry Partnership*. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future.
- Simon, Martin (1999). *A Comprehensive Look At State-Funded, Employer-Focused Job Training Programs*. Washington, DC: National Governors Association.
- Srinath, K.P. (1987). "Miscellaneous Methodological Problems in Designing Continuous Business Surveys: Some Canadian Experiences." *Journal of Official Statistics*, vol. 13, no. 3.

- Strawn, Julie, and Mark Greenberg (2001). *Improving Employment Outcomes under TANF*. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.
- Sweeney, John (2003). *High-Road Partnerships Report*. Washington, DC: AFL-CIO Working for America Institute.
- U.S. Chamber of Commerce (2001). *A Chamber Survey: Spotlight on Workforce Development*. Washington, DC: U.S. Chamber of Commerce.
- U.S. Department of Labor (2001). *Welfare to Work Lessons Learned for TANF and WIA Reauthorization*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.
- U.S. General Accounting Office (2002a). *Workforce Investment Act: States and Localities Increasingly Coordinate Services for TANF Clients*. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office.
- U.S. General Accounting Office (2002b). *Workforce Investment Act: Improvements Needed in Performance Measures to Provide a More Accurate Picture of WIA's Effectiveness*. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office.
- U.S. General Accounting Office (2002c). *Welfare Reform: States' Experience in Providing Employment Assistance to TANF Clients*. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office.
- U.S. General Accounting Office (2002d). *Welfare Reform: States Are Using TANF Flexibility to Adapt Work Requirements and Time Limits to Meet State and Local Needs*. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office.
- U.S. General Accounting Office (2002e). *Workforce Investment Act: Coordination of TANF Services Through One-Stops Has Increased Despite Challenges*. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office.
- U.S. General Accounting Office (2002f). *Workforce Investment Act: Coordination Between TANF Programs and One-Stop Centers Is Increasing, but Challenges Remain*. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office.
- Urban Institute (2002). *Low-Income and Low-Skilled Workers' Involvement in Nonstandard Employment*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Van Horn, Carl, and William A. Tracy (2002). *One-Stop Innovations: Leading Change Under the WIA One-Stop System*. New Brunswick, NJ: John J. Heldrich Center for Workforce Development, State University of New Jersey—Rutgers.
- Wavelet, Melissa, and Jacquie Anderson (2002). "Promoting Self-Sufficiency: What We Know About Sustaining Employment and Increasing Income Among Welfare Recipients and the Working Poor." *Focus*, vol. 22, no. 1 (Special Issue), pp. 56-61.

- Werner, Alan, Lazar Treschan, Kendra Lodewick, Diane Porcari, Anne Hazlett, and Amy Checkoway (2002). *Serving TANF and Low-Income Populations through WIA One-Stop Centers: Survey of Past and Ongoing Research*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
- Working for America Institute (2002). *Helping Low-Wage Workers Succeed Through Innovative Union Partnerships*. Washington, DC: AFL-CIO Working for America Institute.
- Zandniapour, Lily, and Maureen Conway (2001). *Closing the Gap: How Sectoral Workforce Development Programs Benefit the Working Poor*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.
- Zedlewski, S.R. (1999). *Working Activity and Obstacles to Work Among TANF Recipients*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.